

RASHTRAPATI BHAVAN
LIBRARY



Reg. No. 690 47:51

Clas. No. VIII - M



A HISTORY
OF
OUR OWN TIMES

SIXTH VOLUME

BOOKS BY JUSTIN MCCARTHY

THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE. 2 vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.

A HISTORY OF THE FOUR GEORGES AND OF WILLIAM THE FOURTH. By JUSTIN MCCARTHY and JUSTIN HUNTLY MCCARTHY. 4 vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 12s. each.

A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES (from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880). 4 vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 12s. each.—Also a POPULAR EDITION, in 4 vols., crown 8vo, cloth, 6s. each.—And the JUBILEE EDITION, 2 vols., large post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES, Vol. V. (from 1880 to the Diamond Jubilee). Demy 8vo, cloth, 12s.; crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

ST. MARTIN'S LIBRARY EDITIONS of the above Works may also be had as follows: Printed in clear type on fine paper, pott 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 2s. net each; leather, gilt edges, 3s. net each.

THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE, in 1 volume;

A HISTORY OF THE FOUR GEORGES AND OF WILLIAM IV., in 2 volumes; and

A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES (from the Accession of Queen Victoria to 1897), in 3 volumes.

A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES, Vols. VI. and VII. (from the Diamond Jubilee, 1897, to the Accession of King Edward VII.). 2 vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.

A SHORT HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.—Also a POPULAR EDITION, post 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.; and the CHEAP EDITION, medium 8vo, 6d.

REMINISCENCES. With Portrait. 2 vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.

THE STORY OF AN IRISHMAN. Demy 8vo, cloth, 12s.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. each; post 8vo, illustrated boards, 2s. each;
cloth limp, 2s. 6d. each.

DEAR LADY DISDAIN.

LINLEY ROCHFORD.

MY ENEMY'S DAUGHTER.

THE WATERDALE NEIGH-
BOURS.

A FAIR SAXON.

DONNA QUIXOTE.

MISS MISANTHROPE.

THE COMET OF A SEASON.

MAID OF ATHENS.

CAMIOLA: A GIRL WITH A FOR-
TUNE.

THE DICTATOR.

RED DIAMONDS.

THE RIDDLE RING.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. each.

THE THREE DISGRACES.

MONONIA: A Love Story of "Forty-Eight."

"THE RIGHT HONOURABLE." By JUSTIN MCCARTHY and Mrs. CAMPBELL PRAED. Crown 8vo, cloth extra, 6s.

LONDON: CHATTO & WINDUS, 111 ST. MARTIN'S LANE, W.C.

A HISTORY
OF
OUR OWN TIMES

FROM THE DIAMOND JUBILEE 1897
TO THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD VII

BY
JUSTIN M^CCARTHY



IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

LONDON
CHATTO & WINDUS
1905

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press

PREFACE

THESE two concluding volumes of 'A History of Our Own Times' have for their object in the first instance to give a clear and comprehensive account of all the events of public importance occurring in or to the British Empire during the years between Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee and the Accession of King Edward the Seventh. But, besides this obvious object, the volumes include a retrospect of the important changes which the reign of Queen Victoria saw in the public life, the literature, art, and science—more especially the applied science—of that period, the changes which have come about in the habits and the manners of the time; and also the leading characteristics of the men and women who have grown into celebrity during these later years. The reader will thus, it is hoped, be enabled all the better to appreciate the place which these more recent years are destined to hold in the world's history, and to estimate the progress made in political, artistic, scientific, and social life during

the whole of that long period which passed between the Coronation of Queen Victoria and the Coronation of King Edward the Seventh. The author's intention and endeavour are to make these two closing volumes, like those which went before them, not merely a record of events and dates, but a survey of life and of social progress.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. COLONIAL FEDERATION—SOUTH AFRICAN TROUBLES	1
II. GREECE, BUT LIVING GREECE, ONCE MORE . . .	39
III. EMPLOYER AND WORKMAN	63
IV. THE DEATH OF GLADSTONE	98
V. 'ANOTHER DAYBREAK IN THE EAST'	126
VI. THE FAR EAST	159
VII. 'HOW WE HAVE PERFORMED OUR ROMAN RITES' .	191
VIII. 'HERE'S A WOMAN WOULD SPEAK'	226
IX. THE OLD WORLD AND THE NEW	248
X. SOME DEATHS IN 1897	265
XI. THE DEATH-ROLL OF 1898	295
XII. PEACE CLAIMS HER VICTORIES	346
XIII. THE SESSION OF 1899	374

•

A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES.

CHAPTER I.

COLONIAL FEDERATION—SOUTH AFRICAN TROUBLES.

DURING the celebration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in London much public attention was attracted by the prominent position which the representatives of England's colonial empire were invited to take in the pageantry of the occasion. The *Annual Register* for 1897 tells how the Jubilee procession of that year differed in one important particular from that which took place when the Queen's fifty years of Sovereignty were nationally commemorated. 'On the former occasion,' says the *Annual Register*, 'the Sovereigns and Princes of Europe and Asia were the most conspicuous figures in the pageant which seemed designed to show the place occupied by Great Britain and her Queen among the nations of the Eastern and the Western world.' But the later procession, that of the Diamond Jubilee, 'was used,' according to the *Annual Register*, 'to show that semi-independent colonies and far-distant settlements in all parts of

the globe looked up to the Sovereign of Great Britain as their Queen-Mother whose care and protection they cheerfully and loyally acknowledged. Thus it was that, after the Empress Queen herself, the eyes and acclamations of the crowds which lined the route were directed to the Colonial Premiers, the Colonial troops, and the dark auxiliaries from our Asiatic and African dependencies.'

The occasion was indeed one of especial significance for the representatives of the Canadian and Australian colonies. The celebration of the Diamond Jubilee had brought the leading statesmen of those colonies over to London, and the time seemed natural and fitting for a series of conferences on the future relations between the Empire and the colonial states. The idea had for a long time been spreading in Great Britain as well as in Canada and Australia that some great change must take place if the Empire and the colonial dependencies were to remain parts of one imperial system. It was clear to the mind of every one who gave any thought to the subject that a definite understanding must soon be arrived at with regard to the position which the colonies were to hold in the Imperial system. The colonies were growing every year in population, in material prosperity, in education and intelligence, and were beginning to form distinct ideas of their own as to the importance of the future expanding before them.

The progress made by Canada was typical

of the whole colonial development. In the first volume of this History the story of Canada's creation as a colonial state has been told. That story shows how Canada was at the opening of Queen Victoria's reign convulsed by incessant hatreds and quarrels between what we may call the English settlers and the French settlers, the inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canada. These two jarring populations had at the time only one sentiment in common, and that common sentiment was hatred of the Imperial system at Westminster. Then the two races joined in rebellion against the Government of the Queen, and while the British forces in Canada were engaged in crushing the rebellion a great English statesman, Lord Durham, was sent out to take measures for the restoration of peace and order and to advise the Queen's Government as to the best means of securing to Great Britain the future ownership of the colony. Lord Durham surveyed the condition of affairs with the eyes of a statesman and a man of genius. He recommended for Canada the establishment of a system of complete local or national self-government under the British Crown, thus making her a partner in Great Britain's constitutional and commercial system—a willing and loyal partner and not a constrained dependent.

The entire success which attended the adoption of Lord Durham's policy soon began to make it certain that a policy of the same nature must govern the relations of Great Britain with all her

colonies. The only serious doubts and disputes that prevailed were as to the conditions and the reciprocal concessions which would have to be accepted in order to set up a thoroughly working, enduring, and self-developing system. There seems to have been no difference of opinion whatever as to the necessity and the possibility of agreeing upon a general principle which was to make the colonies recognised members in the great Imperial partnership. There was apparently a conviction in the minds of some of the colonial statesmen that to make the principle complete and abiding there would have to be a proportionate representation of the colonial states in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. It was suggested and elaborately argued that there ought to be a certain number of members in the House of Commons who should be elected from the colonies to represent colonial affairs, and that some men of influence among colonial statesmen should receive peerages and thus be enabled to speak for their people in the House of Lords. There was even some talk about the possible adoption of a plan like that prevailing under the constitution of the United States, by virtue of which certain representatives of American territories not yet claiming to be States were allowed to sit in Congress at Washington. These representatives might plead and argue for the interests of those who had sent them there but were not allowed to give their votes in a division.

Nothing practical came of these different suggestions or proposals. It does not seem probable that any real advantage could be obtained for Canadian or Australian colonists by giving them the right to send a small and proportionate number of representatives to the House of Commons. The only immediate effect of such a plan would probably be that whenever some question arose which brought the apparent interests of the colonies into direct antagonism with the apparent interests of the Empire the colonial representatives would always be outvoted, and the result might be so much dissatisfaction in the colonies as to render the prospects of a thorough union less hopeful than before. We have seen what troubles are brought upon the House of Commons by the fact that the Irish National representatives, a comparatively small number in the House, have to plead for the interests of their people against an overwhelming majority of British representatives who can at any crisis combine against the Irish members and utterly outvote them. The plan works well enough where the Scottish representation is concerned, because there has long been a recognised understanding in the House of Commons that the members for Scottish constituencies are to be allowed to arrange among themselves for the carrying of measures applying exclusively to Scotland, and that the British majority is not to combine against them and overbear their arrangements. Scotland, too, before accepting a share in the

Imperial Parliament was able to secure for herself the maintenance of her own code of laws and her own religious and other institutions, and thus the demand for Home Rule, which became so powerful and indomitable in Ireland, never arose in the northern part of Great Britain.

We may take it for granted that the principle of Home Rule already prevailing in practical working condition among the Canadian and Australian colonies will have to be applied to Ireland also, but it would seem hardly worth while to attempt any plan of representation for the colonies in the Imperial Parliament which would in all probability have to be abandoned sooner or later in favour of a definite principle of colonial self-government. We do not find, therefore, that the idea of a colonial representation in the Parliament at Westminster won great favour among the colonists themselves, and it was at no time taken very seriously by English statesmen. There was much interchange of ideas as to the extent and the terms on which the colonies ought to be called upon for their proportionate contribution to the expenses and the practical maintenance of the Imperial Army and Navy. Nothing could have been more satisfactory and more gratifying to English public opinion in general than the spirit in which the colonial statesmen entered upon this part of the discussion. The Canadian and Australian colonies did not show the slightest inclination to haggle over the terms of their responsibility for the main-

tenance of Imperial forces on land and sea. The colonies were ready to do all that might fairly be required of them for the support of the Imperial forces, and even showed a generous eagerness to contribute in money, in men, and in ships towards the strength of the Empire. The fact made most conspicuous during all these proposals and negotiations, if the term 'negotiations' be not somewhat too formal by which to describe the ideas then exchanged, was that among the colonies there prevailed one general and equal desire for a genuine partnership in the Imperial system, and that the idea of colonial separation and absolute colonial independence inspired no movement in Canada or in Australasia.

The colonial statesmen who were in England during the celebration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee explained their principles and purposes at many public meetings held in the metropolis and in some of the large provincial cities. Some of the leading men among English political parties put in an appearance at those meetings, expressed their own views, and entered freely into the general discussion. Nothing could have been more hopeful than the auguries of this free and friendly interchange of views between British and colonial statesmen, and the Queen's Diamond Jubilee may well be regarded as having thus opened a new era in the consolidation and development of the Empire over which Queen Victoria ruled. We shall see before long how the principle of colonial federation evolved itself out of

these discussions, and how it became evident that the only enduring system of partnership which the Empire and the colonies could set up must be one allowing to each colonial State the right of managing its own domestic affairs, leaving to neighbouring colonies the right to form into a separate federation for the general interest of the whole colonial population in that part of the world, and to enter into equitable arrangements with the Sovereign and the Parliament of England on questions which involved the common welfare of the whole Empire. We shall see also how readily and spiritedly the Canadian and Australasian States came to England's help when England was engaged in a long, a heavy, and sometimes even a disastrous war. For the present it is only necessary to invite attention to the interesting and memorable fact that Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee became the occasion for a new and most important development in the story of the relations which at one time appeared to many acute observers but a menace and a danger to the solidity and cohesion of the Empire. The federation of the colonies was destined to grow more and more with every passing year and with every great event, and thus far the omens seem only brighter and brighter for the contentment and prosperity of England's Colonial Empire.

At the same time, it has to be noticed that the rejoicings over the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee were accompanied or were immediately followed by events which reminded the Queen's

subjects that there were still outlying parts of England's Empire from which came only forebodings of heavy trouble. In South Africa, where British colonists had for their near neighbours Boer Republicans and crowds of miscellaneous settlers from all parts of the world who claimed the right to have a way made for them and a place found for them by Imperial power, the condition of things created cares which had to be borne in mind by the English people during their period of national rejoicing.

The anti-climax in any series of events is commonly understood, indeed, almost universally understood, as an occasion for both disappointment and derision. But in the proceedings of the South Africa Committee there occurred after the Whitsuntide holidays of this year what might be called an anti-climax which yet aroused the public to a degree of interest and anxiety that it had not known before. We have already described in this History the general work of the South Africa Committee up to what was, at the time, thought to be the completion of its labours. The Committee had then intimated that its work of hearing evidence was done, and that it only remained to consider and agree upon its report. But when the Committee met again after the Whitsuntide recess it was suddenly decided that at least one witness should be recalled, and this apparently slight modification of the Committee's arrangements brought about an amount of public eagerness, curiosity, and excitement

the like of which had certainly not been awakened by any of the former proceedings. This witness was Miss Flora L. Shaw, a well-known authoress and journalist who had written several novels and had undertaken various special commissions to British colonies on behalf of the *Times* newspaper. Many members of the Committee were especially anxious to discover the exact nature of the relations which prevailed between Dr. Jameson and Mr. Rhodes, and between Dr. Jameson and the Colonial Department at Westminster with regard to the plan and the preparations for the Transvaal Raid. A strong impression prevailed among many sections of society in England and in the colonies that Mr. Rhodes had been in full understanding with Dr. Jameson as to the purposes, the appliances, and the time of his meditated invasion. There were indeed not a few Englishmen and colonists of political position and influence who had a strong suspicion that the Colonial Department in London had not been altogether unacquainted with the plans for the projected raid.

The reason for the recall of Miss Shaw was to ascertain the full story of certain telegrams which appeared to have passed between her and Mr. Rhodes, and the bearing of these telegrams on the supposed understanding between Mr. Rhodes and Dr. Jameson, and possibly even between Dr. Jameson and the Colonial Office. One of the telegrams addressed to Mr. Rhodes, addressed to him by the fictitious telegraphic name of Veldschoen, and signed

by Miss Shaw herself, contains the words, 'Can you advise when will you commence the plans? We wish to send at earliest opportunity sealed instructions representative of the London *Times* European capitals. It is most important using their influence in your favour. — Flora Shaw.' This telegram patently contained nothing in itself which might not naturally have come from the representative of a London newspaper, but it gave the suggestion that Mr. Rhodes was regarded by that representative as one associated in some manner with the enterprise, whatever it was, which was then projected. Another telegram sent to the same address and signed by Miss Shaw declared 'delay dangerous. Sympathy now complete but will depend very much upon action before European Powers given time enter a protest which as European situation considered serious might paralyse Government. General feeling in Stock Market very suspicious.' Yet a third telegram from Miss Shaw to the same address was in the following words: 'Held an interview with Secretary, Transvaal. Left here on Saturday for Hague, Berlin, Paris. Fear negotiations with these parties. Chamberlain sound in case of interference European Powers but have special reason to believe wishes you must do it immediately.' Then on the other hand there were several telegraphic despatches addressed to Miss Shaw, London, Miss Shaw being addressed under the feigned telegraphic name of Telamones. Most of these telegrams

were signed R. Harris and were dated from Cape Town. One of these said, 'Are doing our best but these things take time. Do not alarm Pretoria from London.' A second from the same sender dated Cape Town, December 27, 1895, declared that 'Everything is postponed until after January 6. We are ready but divisions at Johannesburg.' A third, dated Cape Town, December 30, 1895, ran thus: 'Strictly confidential. Dr. Jameson moved to assist English in Johannesburg because he received strong letter begging Dr. Jameson to come signed by leading inhabitants. This letter will be telegraphed you verbatim to-morrow. Meantime do not refer in press. We are confident of success. Johannesburg united and strong on our side. Dissensions have been stopped except two or three Germans.' Then followed a telegram to Miss Shaw's adopted address bearing the same date as that last quoted, signed for C. J. Rhodes. It contained these words: 'Inform Chamberlain that I shall get through all right if he supports me but he must not send cable like he sent to High Commissioner in South Africa to-day. The crux is I will win and South Africa will belong to England.' Another telegram professing to come from C. J. Rhodes a day after the latest quoted said, 'Unless you can make Chamberlain instruct the High Commissioner to proceed at once to Johannesburg the whole position is lost. High Commissioner would receive splendid reception and still turn position to England's advantage but must be instructed

by cable immediately. The instructions must be specific as he is weak and will take no responsibility.'

The suspicions aroused by these telegrams pointed naturally enough to a general understanding of the invasion plot between Mr. Rhodes and Dr. Jameson and even between these men and the Colonial Secretary. If there were such an understanding, and if the three men were quite prepared to have it made known when the right time should come that they were all parties to it, there would be nothing surprising in the mere fact that they should have confided the whole story in advance to the responsible correspondent of an influential London newspaper. But the friends of Mr. Rhodes refused to admit that he ever had been a sharer in the project, and on the part of Mr. Chamberlain and the Colonial Office there was the strongest repudiation of every suggestion that there had been any British Ministerial complicity in Dr. Jameson's enterprise. Miss Shaw, when recalled by the Committee as a witness, declared that she believed the telegrams as produced to be 'practically accurate.' She added, however, that there was another telegram of which no record had been kept by the telegraphic company. This telegram was sent by her to Mr. Rhodes on January 1, 1896, and it stated to the best of her recollection that Mr. Chamberlain was 'awfully angry.' She explained her messages as merely intended to obtain a full knowledge for newspaper purposes of what was actually going on in South Africa, and she added

that the editor of the *Times* knew nothing of these statements until some weeks after, and that she had sent them altogether on her own responsibility. She was questioned with regard to the meaning of the words, 'delays dangerous,' in one of her messages to Mr. Rhodes, and she declared emphatically that she never at any time gave the Colonial Office any information about the project and had never received any information whatever from the Colonial Office on the subject. When questioned further about the words, 'Chamberlain sound,' and that Chamberlain 'wished it done immediately,' she stated that she was only embodying in these words the impression she had derived from public speeches made by the Colonial Secretary in which he had expatiated on the necessity of keeping British power paramount in South Africa, and had given it as his belief that no foreign interference in that quarter would be tolerated. Miss Shaw also stated that the project of such an invasion had been commonly discussed for a long time before it actually took place, that she had herself talked on the subject with one of the under-secretaries to the Colonial Office, and in the course of the conversation he said that 'If the Johannesburgers are going to rise it is to be hoped they will do it soon.' During this part of the evidence Mr. Chamberlain himself interposed with the words, 'I said in the House of Commons that everybody knew, even the man in the street, that there would be an insurrection in Johannesburg, but nobody knew of the

invasion.' Miss Shaw gave her prompt adhesion to this view, and in answer to further questions said that she had always in her evidence and in her telegrams drawn an absolute distinction between the 'plan' and the 'raid,' and she asked the Committee to bear that fact prominently in their minds. She explained that as she understood the whole situation Dr. Jameson had been asked to have a force in the background in case it should be wanted, but she understood that the object of the plan was for the Johannesburgers to appeal from the local authority at Pretoria to the suzerain power and then leave their case wholly in the hands of the Imperial Government. She assured the Committee that this was the only plan of which she knew anything, and that she had no idea whatever of any such project as that of the raid which afterwards actually took place.

This was in fact the whole substance of the evidence given by Miss Shaw when she was recalled before the Committee, and it appears plain enough that if there were no other consideration to be taken into account it might be admitted that the explanation was consistent and satisfactory. Everybody who was at all interested in the progress of events in South Africa must have felt satisfied, long in advance, that some serious change in the state of affairs was certain to take place there sooner or later. It might well have been that the Johannesburgers merely intended to make a formal appeal to the Imperial Government for active inter-

vention on their behalf to rescue them from the power of the Transvaal and to bring their region under the direct supremacy of the British Crown. Under these conditions it would be quite natural that a man like Mr. Rhodes should hold frank communication with the Colonial Office, and should seek for an interchange of ideas as to the course which ought to be taken should this or that expected or foreshadowed event come to pass. Indeed during the previous sittings of the Committee it had been made known that Mr. Chamberlain kept up a close communication with Sir Hercules Robinson, afterwards Lord Rosmead, then High Commissioner of South Africa, and had impressed on him the necessity for taking effective steps to prevent any inopportune outbreak of an attack on the Transvaal Republic. It would be quite impossible that a constant succession of telegraphic messages should go on among Government officials and others at such a time and on such subjects without containing occasional phrases or sentences which might be susceptible of a double meaning. The writers of telegrams intended to cross the ocean are naturally anxious to make brevity the soul of wit, and they do not explain their full and precise meaning with the rigorous exactness needed for a clause in an Act of Parliament or for the pages of a volume which was to come under the notice of intolerant critics. Therefore the Committee might well have been inclined to make allowance for any questionable passages in the telegraphic despatches

and not to strain too rigidly any inferences from them.

But then came up the important fact that the Committee had been unable to secure for their present sitting the attendance of Dr. Rutherford Harris, the sender of some of the telegrams just mentioned, a man whose attendance was thought especially necessary at that part of the investigation. The Committee, it seemed, had been unable to obtain the address of Dr. Harris, and could get no more precise information as to his whereabouts than the fact that he was somewhere abroad. There was also in the minds of many members of the Committee a conviction that as there were certain telegrams which were known to be in the possession of Mr. Hawksley, who had been solicitor to Mr. Rhodes, and as these telegrams had not been produced, the evidence was wholly incomplete so far as the origin and encouragement of the Jameson Raid were concerned. One member of the Committee, Mr. Edward Blake, a man who had for the greater part of his working life held a high place among the leading and most influential public men in Canadian politics, and had afterwards entered the House of Commons as the Nationalist representative of an Irish constituency, was so unfavourably impressed by the disappearance of Dr. Harris and the destruction or suppression of several telegrams, that he refused to take any further part in the conduct of the investigation. Our readers may be reminded that Dr. Harris had

been the Secretary in South Africa to the Chartered Company of which Mr. Rhodes was the managing director, from the grant of the charter until Mr. Rhodes resigned that position in 1896. Mr. Hawksley had refused during the earlier meetings of the Committee to hand over the telegrams which had passed between him and Mr. Rhodes, contending that his refusal was justified by the rule which protects privileged communications between solicitor and client. Many members of the Committee, and among them some men of leading position in the profession of the law, contended that the right of the Committee to compel Mr. Rhodes himself to make disclosures enabled them to enforce the same authority on Mr. Hawksley. Mr. Rhodes, it should be said, claimed no right whatever to withhold full communication to the Committee of any news he had received, telegraphic or otherwise. Mr. Hawksley, however, still held to his own position, and refused to produce certain of the telegrams.

These facts were brought home more distinctly than ever to the notice of the Committee at the later meetings when Miss Shaw was recalled as a witness and had made the statements which we have just summarised. The general impression on the minds of most of the Committee was that a clear distinction had been satisfactorily established between the arrangements at one time in progress for some movement on the part of the Johannesburgers to obtain and to support the direct inter-

vention of the Imperial Government, and the plans which were secretly going on for Dr. Jameson's Raid. Even if it could be shown, as the evidence did apparently show, that Mr. Rhodes was himself a party to the project of Dr. Jameson, there did not seem reason to assume that the Colonial Office knew anything about that particular project, or that Mr. Chamberlain, when referring in his communications to an approaching crisis, could be assumed to have any suspicion of the existence of such an enterprise as that which Dr. Jameson had attempted to carry out. But there could be no question that Miss Shaw's evidence had much deepened the belief prevailing among many members of the Committee, and very widely among the outer public, that Mr. Rhodes had been fully acquainted with the preparation of the enterprise unsuccessfully led by Dr. Jameson.

One of the most active members of the Committee was Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. Labouchere was always a man who formed direct and positive opinions on any subject which he took into consideration. He was not likely to suppress or even to modify his opinions out of regard for the convenience of a Government or for the interests of any great chartered or other company. Mr. Labouchere had taken a very active part in the work of the Committee and in the examination of witnesses, and he now undertook to prepare and to submit a draft report of his own which he proposed as an appropriate conclusion to the investigation.

The general effect of this draft report was to declare that owing to the unwillingness of some of the witnesses to disclose all that had come to their knowledge, and owing to Mr. Hawksley's positive refusal to produce certain telegrams in his possession, the inquiry had come to little or nothing so far as the Jameson Raid was concerned. Mr. Labouchere's report admitted frankly that there was no evidence whatever to connect the Colonial Office or the Imperial officials in South Africa with any concern in Dr. Jameson's enterprise, but he expressed his regret that the alleged complicity of the Colonial Office had not been made more distinctly and pressingly a subject of inquiry, because the slightest appearance of any indisposition to push the investigation to the fullest extent might lead the public to suspect that the Colonial Office was to some degree a party to the Jameson plan.

The report proposed by Mr. Labouchere had not of course the slightest chance of being accepted by the majority of the Committee. Some of the leading members of the Committee were pledged supporters of the late Liberal Government, and some had even held high offices in that Administration. So long as the mere inquiry by the Committee was going on these Liberal members had taken an active and searching part in the endeavour to ascertain exactly the full extent of Mr. Rhodes' connection with the Jameson Raid, and had even put questions with regard to the action of the Colonial Office which might have suggested some doubt in their

minds as to the absolute candour of Mr. Chamberlain's explanations. It can be easily understood that when Mr. Chamberlain explicitly disclaimed every or any complicity with plans of invasion or knowledge of their existence, those who had been his associates in the Liberal party, while he was yet a member of that party, readily and sincerely accepted his assurance. But at the same time something in the course taken by those Liberal members of the Committee suggested that a crisis had arisen in the inquiry which commonly marks a difference of policy between men who have held office in an Administration and men who have only been private members of Parliament. Such a crisis is familiar enough to the observation of those who follow with enduring interest the proceedings of the House of Commons. Some question arises when the too pertinacious pressure of a Parliamentary inquiry might seem to involve inconvenient consequences to all Administrations as well as to the one Administration the conduct of which is the subject of inquisition. Then comes the moment when the men who have been members of a Government and will probably hold that position again are apt to look upon the whole question from a point of view not likely to be taken by the private member who has never been, and does not expect or perhaps does not desire to be, in office. The man who has held a place in a Ministry and may hold it again after the next General Election is naturally inclined to admit that there are difficulties common

alike to all Administrations and to shrink from pressing too severely on the hostile Administration, for the reason that to put on such a pressure might only establish a precedent that could be used against a Government of which he himself might be a member.

Men who had themselves held office could easily make allowance for the difficulties surrounding the Conservative Administration when the crisis arose in the Transvaal. The mind of the English public was then in a very excited condition. That sentiment which was at one time described as Jingoism by those who did not share it, and has since come to be spoken of usually under the more graceful appellation of Imperialism, was much stirred, and very potent at the time. The Conservative Government must have known very well that their best chance of popularity was to be found in their general hostility towards the Transvaal Republic, and that so long as they did not carry the hostility too far and too openly their attitude would win for them some sympathy even among Liberal electors. The Conservative Government might therefore have found it for their interest to show a certain leaning towards those who in South Africa and out of it were endeavouring and combining to overthrow the Transvaal Republic. A Liberal statesman, who had himself been in office, might find the thought come up in his mind that a Liberal Administration would under the same conditions have been pressed by much the same

difficulties. The Liberal statesman in opposition might have remembered the coming of some crisis, while he was in office, which made his Administration particularly anxious that the whole of the correspondence carried on between the Colonial Secretary and some of England's dependencies or neighbours should not be brought suddenly before the eyes of the public. Not perhaps that he believed his Government had been entering into any arrangements inconsistent with their public duty, but that they might have been, just at the time, perplexed between the pressure of popular opinion out-of-doors and the necessity of keeping some sort of compromise in prospect. There is a certain fellow-feeling on such subjects between those who are actually in office and those who are now out of office but may be in again. It seems quite probable that some such fellow-feeling influenced more than one Liberal member of the Committee and made them anxious not to press too severely on the manner in which the Conservative Government had conducted its dealings with Mr. Rhodes and those who were more or less in co-operation with him.

It soon became quite clear that Mr. Labouchere was not likely to have many supporters for the draft report which he presented to the Committee. Mr. Labouchere in his report found fault with the indisposition shown by the Committee to inquire more closely into the relations between the Colonial Office and Mr. Rhodes. He thought it might lead

some of the public to suppose that there was an amount of truth in the statements of witnesses connected with the Jameson plan that the secret aims of Mr. Rhodes were more or less clearly revealed to the Colonial Office. There does not seem to have been anything unreasonable or extreme in this mode of criticism, but it appeared to be taken by some members of the Committee as if it had implied a direct censure on the Colonial Office and the Government. Mr. Labouchere's report had therefore no real backing-up in the Committee, and the report adopted by the majority was of a very different nature. Much of it consisted merely of a summary of historical facts already well known to Parliament and to the public. It condemned, to a certain extent, the conduct of Mr. Rhodes, but the condemnation was carefully qualified. It pointed out that Mr. Rhodes occupied a great position in South Africa as Prime Minister of Cape Colony, and that beyond all other persons he should have been careful to abstain from such a course of action as that which he adopted. As managing director of the British South African Company, as director of the De Beers Consolidated Mines and the Gold Fields of South Africa, Mr. Rhodes controlled a great combination of interests, and, as the report put it, 'he used his position and those interests to promote and assist his policy.' Then the report declared that 'whatever justification there might have been for action on the part of the people of Johannesburg, there was

none for the conduct of a person in Mr. Rhodes' position in subsidising, organising, and stimulating an armed insurrection against the Government^{of} the South African Republic, and employing the forces and resources of the Chartered Company to support such a revolution.' With regard to the Jameson Raid, the report expressed the opinion that 'although Dr. Jameson "went in" without Mr. Rhodes' authority, it was always part of the plan that certain forces should be used in the Transvaal in the support of an insurrection.' The report summed up the case against Mr. Rhodes thus: 'such a policy once embarked upon inevitably involved Mr. Rhodes in grave breaches of duty to those whom he owed allegiance'; that 'he deceived the High Commissioner representing the Imperial Government, he concealed his views from his colleagues in the Colonial Ministry and from the board of the British South African Company, and led his subordinates to believe that his plans were approved by his superiors.'

We may remark in passing on the fact that this very admission amply justified of itself the attitude taken up by those members of the Committee who insisted that a fuller inquiry ought to have been made into the whole subject of Mr. Rhodes' dealing with the Colonial Office. The greater the blame to be attached to him the greater was the necessity for making it clear, beyond all dispute, that there was no desire on the part of the Government to prevent the fullest

investigation into the action of the Colonial Office. The more a member of the Committee felt convinced that Mr. Chamberlain's statement was quite satisfactory, the more anxious he ought to have been that every inquiry should be encouraged which might confirm Mr. Chamberlain's statement in the mind of the general public. As it happened, there unquestionably remained among a large and intelligent proportion of the community a feeling that an unwise, unjust, and unintelligible objection to a full inquiry into this part of the subject had been shown by the majority of the Committee. The report of the Committee stated very decisively that 'neither the Secretary of State for the Colonies nor any of the officials of the Colonial Office received any information which made them, or should have made them or any of them, aware of the plot during its development.' One can easily imagine an unofficial observer commenting on this declaration with the words, 'Why then did you show such a desire to restrict the inquiry in the dealings between Mr. Rhodes and the Colonial Office?' We do not suggest that the Colonial Office was in any sense responsible either through Mr. Rhodes or Dr. Jameson for any part of the invasion project. We are quite willing to believe that Mr. Chamberlain's statements disclosed the full truth on this subject. But the British public can hardly be supposed to have studied closely the characters of all heads of administrative departments and their leading officials,

and is apt to imagine, when an inquiry into the conduct of such men is suddenly and somewhat narrowly limited in its scope, the limitation must be caused by an official desire to keep something in the dark which might otherwise come inconveniently into the light.

The Committee declared in the fifth article of its report that there was not the slightest evidence 'that the late High Commissioner in South Africa, Lord Rosmead, was made acquainted with Mr. Rhodes' plans. The evidence, on the contrary, shows that there was a conspiracy to keep all information on the subject from him.' Yet there did not seem to be on the part of the Committee any desire to limit unduly the inquiry into the nature of dealings between Lord Rosmead and Mr. Rhodes. Every one who knew anything concerning the inner history of what had passed in South Africa must have known very well that Lord Rosmead was not the man to encourage or to tolerate such plans as those devised by Dr. Jameson and apparently patronised by Mr. Rhodes. The report declared certain officials in South Africa guilty of a grave dereliction of duty in having failed to communicate to their superiors all the information which had come to their knowledge. But the majority of the Committee did not seem much inclined towards any unreasonable severity of sentence. In the concluding article of the report the Committee 'desire to put on record an absolute and unqualified condemnation of the Raid and of the

plans which made it possible. The result caused for the time being grave injury to British influence in South Africa. Public confidence was shaken, race feeling embittered, and serious difficulties were created with neighbouring States.' Considering the actual facts which had so lately been brought to the knowledge of the country and the whole civilised world this final summing up by the Committee would seem to be somewhat in the nature of a platitude. Nobody in his senses could suppose that a Committee composed of leading and influential members of the House of Commons would be likely to express or to hold a contrary opinion on such a question.

There was a general feeling of disappointment with the announced results of the whole inquiry. The [report adopted by the majority of the Committee, which therefore became the official report of the whole Committee, only told the world all that it knew well before any Parliamentary investigation had been undertaken. On some of the points concerning which anxiety and doubt were felt the Committee had apparently declined to press the inquiry beyond a certain conventional limit, and had left the doubters in a condition to express their scepticism more freely and positively. The feeling as to the unsatisfactory nature of the report prevailed strongly among the more advanced Liberals in the House of Commons. Almost immediately after the report had been published, Mr. Balfour, as leader of the House, was asked whether the Govern-

ment would not set apart a day for the discussion of the subject. Mr. Balfour quietly replied that he could not see how any useful purpose was to be served by entering on such a discussion, and his reply appeared to be accepted without objection from any of the leading Liberals, the men, that is to say, who had been in office before and might fairly expect to be in office again. But the more advanced Liberals did not seem by any means content with this mode of putting away all debate, and Sir Wilfrid Lawson, always a very advanced and absolutely independent member, pressed the leader of the House strongly to say whether the Government really meant to take no action whatever on the report of the Committee. Mr. Balfour's reply was as cautious and discouraging as might have been expected. He told the House that the Government were at present devoting close attention to the whole subject of the future administration of the Chartered Company's territories, and that they intended to consult the directors of the company, Sir Alfred Milner, and the ruling authorities of Cape Colony.

This was not the sort of reply which Sir Wilfrid Lawson's question was intended to bring out. No reasonable human being could have the slightest doubt that the Government must take into consideration the position, the policy, and the future operations of the Chartered Company, seeing that it was utterly impossible things could be allowed to go on as they had been going without some con-

sideration and controlling interposition on the part of Her Majesty's Government. Mr. Labouchere promptly seized the opportunity and endeavoured to raise what is known in the House as a question of privilege. He called the attention of the House to the fact that the South Africa Committee had had one witness before them, Mr. Hawksley, who had positively refused to produce certain documents which the Committee had demanded, and he desired to know whether under these circumstances it was not within the right of any member of the House to move that the witness who had thus acted should be brought up at the bar. The Speaker gave it as his decision that no question of privilege could be raised in this instance. He informed the House that there was no precedent for the course suggested by Mr. Labouchere, unless when a committee of inquiry had itself made a special report calling on the House to take such action. The South Africa Committee, the Speaker pointed out, had made no such report. Moreover, the Speaker reminded the House that the Hawksley incident had occurred some considerable time ago, while the meaning of a question of privilege was that a case had suddenly arisen which called for immediate action. Thereupon Mr. Leonard Courtney, a man of great intellect and long experience of public affairs, who held a thoroughly independent position in the House, created a strong effect by asking the Speaker whether there was any precedent for a committee declining or neglecting to make a special

report under such peculiar conditions, and whether the House itself must be held to have lost its privilege merely because the Committee had failed to do its duty. Mr. Courtney's question seemed to most of the Liberals, and to some even of the Ministerial supporters, to have hit the nail on the head. The Speaker would give no answer more decisive than the statement that he knew of no precedent bearing upon such a case, and that he had in fact already given his opinion. It seemed for the moment as if the Government had scored a victory and might be enabled to bring the Session to an end without allowing the House any chance of a debate on the important questions, national and international, which were opened up by the South Africa Committee.

Another attempt, however, was made with some success to force the Government into an explanation on the subject. The attempt this time was made by a man who could not be supposed to have much sympathy with any of the characteristic political opinions of Mr. Labouchere and Sir Wilfrid Lawson. This was Mr. Arnold-Forster, who was then described in Parliamentary directories as a Liberal Unionist, but who might be fairly regarded as an advanced and a very intelligent and capable Conservative. Mr. Arnold-Forster raised a strong protest against the attempt made by the Government to bring on the Colonial Office vote at a late hour of the sitting on July 19, when the Session was drawing to its close. He insisted that it would

be out of all reason for the House of Commons to pass this vote without full and deliberate consideration of the momentous questions raised by the state of affairs in South Africa, a state of affairs the knowledge of which had only recently reached the House, and had not yet been submitted to any manner of Parliamentary consideration. He made a strong and severe attack on the policy and the conduct of Mr. Rhodes, who, as he put it, had lighted a brand of discord which would probably flame for another century. Mr. Arnold-Forster also spoke with utter condemnation of the Committee's report, and showed an amount of earnestness and energy in the whole of his speech which carried with him the general feeling of the House—the feeling, it may be believed, of many members who, if a division had then been taken, would nevertheless have voted with the Government or would have modestly declined to show themselves in either division lobby.

Mr. Balfour replied to Mr. Arnold-Forster's speech with a warmth and vehemence not often to be observed in his somewhat easy-going, contemptuous, and cynical style of dealing with the attacks of a critic. The unusual vehemence he displayed only gave an added effect and importance to the onslaught of the Liberal Unionist. Mr. Balfour's interposition in the discussion and some of the remarks he made were a strong provocation to Sir William Harcourt to declare his views on the immediate question. Mr. Balfour had said

something to the effect that if there really were any strong feeling in the House as to the necessity of a full discussion of the report on the South Africa Committee, the Government might not unnaturally have expected that some question of the kind would have come from among the leaders of the Opposition. Mr. Balfour by this suggestion was undoubtedly and perhaps quite deliberately putting on Sir William Harcourt the necessity of explaining at once the position of himself and his party. If the leader of the Opposition had allowed the challenge to pass without reply he would clearly have accepted for himself and his party the position of auxiliaries to the Conservative Government in their South African policy, an acknowledgment which no doubt Mr. Balfour would have accepted with much gratification. It seems hard to suppose that Mr. Balfour could have imagined there was any likelihood of the Liberal leaders accepting such a humiliating position. Every one knew, and Mr. Balfour must have known as well as any other, that among many influential and popular members of the Liberal party there was a resolute and deliberate hostility to the general policy of the Government in South Africa, and to the manner in which the Committee had dealt with some of the most critical questions submitted to its decision. In this condition of things it was not to be expected that a political leader like Sir William Harcourt would have taken any course, no matter what his personal opinions might be, which put absolutely out of con-

sideration the sentiments of so many capable and popular members of his own party. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that Sir William Harcourt held any opinions on those subjects which could have brought him into antagonism with so many of the men immediately surrounding him. The leader of the Opposition promptly replied that the Government were hardly called upon to wait for a direct demand from him before granting the reasonable request that full time should be set apart to enable the House of Commons to enter upon a thorough consideration of the important subjects on which the House had not yet been allowed any opportunity of forming or expressing a distinct opinion.

Mr. Balfour, thus pressed, yielded so far as to say that he would endeavour to find a convenient time for the discussion of the question, and only urged as a condition that the subject must be raised in some form which would enable the House of Commons to take a conclusive division. The more advanced among the Liberals promptly acted on this suggestion, and one of their ablest members and most effective speakers, Mr. Philip Stanhope, gave notice of a resolution, 'That this House regrets the inconclusive action and report of the Select Committee on British Africa, and especially the failure of that Committee to recommend specific steps with regard to Mr. Rhodes, and to report to this House the refusal of Mr. Hawksley to obey the order of the Committee to produce copies of certain telegrams

which he admitted were in his possession, and which he had already submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies at his request in July 1896 ; that Mr. Hawksley be ordered to attend at the bar of the House upon a day appointed for the purpose, and then and there produce the aforesaid telegrams.' This resolution, it will be seen, dealt with two distinct and different questions. It condemned the report as a whole, and it further called upon the House to issue an order for a summons to Mr. Hawksley to appear at its bar and produce the missing telegrams. The practical difference between these two parts of the resolution was that men like Sir William Harcourt and Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, who had both signed the report which the resolution condemned, could not be expected to accept its opening clause while they might nevertheless be quite willing to submit to a decision of the House calling upon Mr. Hawksley to appear at the bar. The Speaker, however, resolved to treat the resolution as a whole, and thereupon the debate set in.

It was in every sense a most interesting and most important debate. Mr. Stanhope in his telling speech declared emphatically [that from the very beginning of this South African controversy there had been a marked anxiety on the part of the authorities to prevent a full investigation into all the subjects involved in that inquiry, and as far as possible to stifle public discussion. On the other hand, he maintained that outside the House itself,

and among the public in general, there was a most earnest desire that the whole subject should be fully and resolutely inquired into, and that blame should be positively laid on the shoulders of those who had authority to carry on such a work, but had [from whatever reason endeavoured to render the investigation inconclusive and meaningless. The immediate effect of this speech seemed at one time likely to favour the idea maintained by the more advanced Liberals, that the leaders of parties on both sides of the House were alike unwilling to give any countenance to the proposed discussion. The expectation of most members was that as Mr. Stanhope's resolution seemed in its earlier part to include some of the leaders of Opposition in the censure it proposed, some leading man on the front Opposition bench would rise immediately after Mr. Stanhope's speech to explain fully the attitude of the Liberal leaders towards the opinions it expressed. But there was evident hesitation on the part of those who occupied the front Opposition bench, and as always happens on such an occasion the Liberal followers in general shrank from asserting themselves in a debate in which their leaders had not shown them the way. The Speaker had actually risen to put the question when Mr. Labouchere, who could hardly be said to acknowledge any absolute leadership, saw that somebody must speak if the whole House were not for ever to hold its peace on the subject, and he prevented the Speaker from going any further by entering on the

debate himself with satirical bitterness. Mr. Labouchere suggested clearly enough that there was between the two front benches of the House a conspiracy of silence with regard to the subject of the South Africa report. Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Chamberlain both interrupted the orator in order to protest against this interpretation of their conduct, but Mr. Labouchere was not a man to be easily disconcerted, and without giving any attention to the protest he went on to denounce with great vehemence and with many sarcastic phrases the conduct of Mr. Rhodes and the policy pursued by the majority of the Committee.

There followed a long and somewhat passionate debate in which some of the leaders on both front benches took part—a debate, however, which did little to effect the opinions of any who listened to it or who read the reports of it in the newspapers of the following day. Those who had reason to feel convinced that the Committee ought to have followed up their report by recommending action of some kind were not likely to be much impressed by the mere assurance that the leading members of the Committee had all acted to the best of their judgment and with the purest motives. On the other hand, the men who felt that they had, under all the conditions, good political reasons for acting as they had done were not likely to be convinced of error by the eloquence of Mr. Stanhope or the sarcasms of Mr. Labouchere. The debate, as might be expected, ended in a great majority for the

Ministry. Seventy-seven members voted for Mr. Stanhope's resolution and 304 against it. But it has to be borne in mind that a large number of members who were present during the whole of the debate took good care not to show themselves in either of the division lobbies. It is not too much to assume that those who thus abstained from voting, were not in sympathy with the occupants of the front benches on the one side of the House or the other. The victory was indeed for the leaders on both sides of the House, for the men actually in office and those who had been in office and might be there again. It was a victory won against the opinion of many members on both sides and that of a large majority of the public out-of-doors. Thus came to a close the work of a Committee which had been especially chosen of men supposed to be exceptionally qualified to sound to its deepest depths the whole question of South African trouble.

It is a fact worthy of mention as both appropriate and significant that not very many days after this decision of the House of Commons, President Kruger, speaking in the Transvaal Volksrath, repudiated the suzerainty of Great Britain, but admitted that his intention was to observe the terms settled upon by the London Convention.

•

CHAPTER II.

GREECE, BUT LIVING GREECE ONCE MORE.

WE have already told in the fifth volume of this History the story of the great national movement which was revived in Greece and throughout all the Greek islands for the rescue of Crete from the barbarous tyranny of Ottoman rule. There was at that time a sort of concert among some of the great European Powers, England being one, for the maintenance of order in Turkey and for the restoration of something like peace and the possibility of national existence to the inhabitants of Crete as well as to the inhabitants of Macedonia. The orgies of Turkish misgovernment in Crete became worse and worse with every day that passed, and the concerted European Powers found themselves under the necessity of taking some steps to restore order there. The Cretans broke out in actual rebellion against their Turkish rulers and the whole sympathy of Greece went with the Cretan patriotic insurrection. The great Powers admitted that something must be done. Their first idea was to obtain for Crete a constitution of her own while

leaving her still under Ottoman dominion, and thus to enable the inhabitants to have some control over the management of their own affairs and to live under the conditions which belonged to a civilised State. There were, however, two antagonistic influences, each of which from its own point of view appeared alike destined to reject that proposed solution of the question. In the first place it would have been impossible for any reasonable man to have the slightest hope that Crete could work satisfactorily a constitution of her own and maintain her population in peace and comfort so long as Turkey was allowed to retain her sovereignty of the island and to have the right of sending Turkish officials and troops to keep the Cretans in what the authorities at Constantinople would regard as order. In the second place it was impossible that either the Cretans themselves or the population of the Greek Kingdom could be induced to accept as final any arrangement, brought about no matter by what diplomatic concert, which had for its object the maintenance of Ottoman suzerainty over the island and the severance of its people from complete federation with the kingdom which represents the Hellenic race. There is no Greek population which is more thoroughly Hellenic in its origin, its history, its national sentiments and aspirations than that which inhabits the Cretan island. The merest stranger cannot travel through Crete without becoming satisfied that the people of that island are just as Greek

in the full meaning of the word as the Greeks of the mainland kingdom.

Greece itself was all this time aflame with impassioned sympathy for the Cretans, and it would have been vain for any Government to hope to maintain itself in the kingdom if it seemed willing to stand calmly by and allow Crete to be annexed once again to the dominions of the Sultan. Greece, it must be owned, showed itself quite equal to the occasion. Thus it was that it proved itself, in reversal of Byron's melancholy and almost despairing words, living Greece once more. At the opening of the year 1897, Crete was nothing better than a battleground between Cretans and Ottoman Turks, between Christians and Mussulmans. The Turkish authorities had not force enough in the island to maintain order, even if they had been at all inclined to maintain order, by the suppression of Mahommedan outrages upon the Christian inhabitants. An impassioned agitation began in Athens, and the Greek Sovereign was called upon with something like absolute unanimity to intervene directly for the defence and protection of the Cretan population. On the 8th February the Cretans openly proclaimed the union of their island with the kingdom of Greece. The Greek Sovereign found himself compelled to make some definite demonstration of his sympathy with the cause of the insurgents. Prince George of Greece, a near relative of the King and a connection of the British Royal Family, was sent to

Crete with some ships of war and a small military force. The European concerted Powers protested strongly against this course of action, declaring it to be a breach of all existing treaties and dangerous to any chance of the restoration of peace. The concerted Powers were indeed but in poor and doubtful concert as to any action which ought to be taken on their part. England and Italy were on the whole inclined to favour the Greek cause, but most of the other Powers were more disposed to settle the whole matter for the time by maintaining the existing conditions through the exercise of superior strength.

Throughout England during this crisis the main force of public opinion, outside merely diplomatic circles, was cordially in favour of the Cretan claim to be acknowledged as part of the Greek kingdom. But this was just one of those occasions when the men in legislative authority are enabled to domineer over a popular sentiment by insisting that they must be allowed to maintain their full responsibility of action if the whole world is not to be plunged into war. We were told again and again in England by authoritative voices that if the claims of Crete were pushed too far the immediate result must be that the European concert would come to utter discord, that Russia would do this, Germany would do that, France would do something else, and the upshot might be a war which would rage all over Europe. The Powers still in agreement made up

their minds that the best thing to be done for the moment was to encircle Crete with the fleets of the Powers under the chief command of the Italian admiral, and that the towns of the island must be occupied by the naval and military forces of the great States. Germany went a step farther than this and proposed that the concerted Powers should set up a combined blockade of the Greek ports in order to prevent Greece from giving any further help to the Cretan insurrection against the Turks. We are glad to be able to say that England and Italy both objected decidedly to any such action and that no such reactionary step was taken. In the meanwhile the forces of the concerted Powers did all they could to discourage the insurrection by occasionally bombarding the insurgents who came within the range of their guns and by preventing help in the shape of men and supplies sent by Greeks from landing on the shores of the island that was now the scene of internecine war.

At the same time the concerted Powers thought it prudent and statesmanlike to try once more the resources of diplomatic action. A joint note was prepared and addressed to the Greek Government—a note which does not seem quite calculated to bring about the restoration of peace in the disturbed island. The first article of this note declared as the decision of the concerted Powers that Crete could in no case be annexed to Greece under existing circumstances. That declaration

in itself might well be enough to drive the Cretans and the Greeks into absolute despair and make the inhabitants of the kingdom and the island ready to show, as Greeks had already shown at no distant period of their history, that they were willing to die for their national cause. A second article of the treaty made something more of a pretence at compromise and conciliation. It announced that as Turkey had delayed executing the reforms agreed upon by her in concert with the Powers so that these reforms were no longer equal to the existing demands of the crisis, the Powers 'are resolved, while maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, to endow Crete with an absolutely effective autonomy which shall assure her a separate Government under the suzerainty of the Sultan.' Now it might seem to the undiplomatic student of history that neither the Greeks nor the Cretans would ever consent to submit for long to any system of Government under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and that no such Government could endow Crete with an absolute autonomy unless the great Powers were to undertake the task of acting as police for that part of the Mediterranean and preventing the Sultan from interfering by force to carry out in Crete the policy of Stamboul. It is hardly to be imagined that the vicissitudes of human affairs would allow the great Powers to devote themselves exclusively to this task, or to maintain for an indefinite time any systematic policy of

harmonious action among themselves with that object.

But the joint note had yet a good deal to say on the general subject. It went on to announce the conviction of the European Cabinets that their views 'can only be realised if the Greek vessels and forces now in the waters or on the territories of the island, which is occupied by the Powers, are withdrawn.' The note therefore proclaimed that the allies 'Look with confidence for this decision from the wisdom of the King's Government, who cannot wish to persist in a course opposed to the determination of the Powers, resolved as they are to bring about a speedy pacification which is as indispensable to Crete as it is to the maintenance of the general peace.' The declaration of the concerted Powers wound up with the announcement that if within six days the forces and ships of Greece were not withdrawn from the territories and the waters of the island, the allies were 'irrevocably determined not to hesitate at any measures of constraint.' In other words, the concerted Powers made known their irrevocable resolve that Greece as a State should have nothing whatever to do with the protecting of the island which was thoroughly Greek in origin, in history, and in national sentiment, and that if Greece still persisted in her efforts to help the Cretans the Powers with their almost unlimited resources would take on themselves to do the work of Turkey and compel Greece to abandon the Cretans to their fate.

The Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs put in the suggestion that the Greek troops in Crete should be entrusted with the work of keeping peace between the Christians and the Mussulmans while an arrangement for a definite settlement of the whole question was still going on. This would seem to the ordinary observer a very reasonable proposition under all the circumstances. No number of troops which Greece could possibly get together, even if she were to apply her whole military and naval forces to the work, would be able to maintain the island against the concerted Powers if Greece were to depart from the mere duty of acting as a police force to maintain order in the island and were to act independently on her own account. The concerted Powers refused by a large majority to listen to this proposition. There was only one exception to the refusal, and Englishmen must always be glad to remember that this one exception was England herself. Greece gave it as her reply to the note that she could not withdraw her forces from the island so long as the Christian population there was in daily danger of massacre from the Mussulmans, who knew that they were acting with the sympathy of the Ottoman authorities. The Cretan insurgents firmly and frankly declared that they would not accept any settlement of the immediate problem which did not at least tend towards the union of Crete with the Greek Kingdom. The Greek Government made the very reasonable and moderate proposition that

a plebiscite of the islanders should be taken, under the protection of the Powers, in order to ascertain the real wishes of Crete on this essential question. Now seeing that the Powers had gone so far as to agree upon setting up the autonomy of Crete whether Turkey liked it or not, it might well be expected that they would accept and act upon the suggestion of the Greek Government. The plebiscite had been recognised on many important occasions as the natural and only means of ascertaining the real wishes of a people when foreign Powers went so far as to agree on some plan of action for the pacification of any community not strong enough to hold her own against the oppression of a detested ruler.

One cannot help regretting that England did not maintain her own separate views more strongly in this instance and did not either insist that the proposal of the Greek Government must be accepted or else definitely withdraw from the concert and announce that she was determined to maintain the right of free and independent movement according as the developments of the crisis might influence her. England, however, did not press her resolve thus far, and the immediate effect was that Greece and Turkey alike made manifest their preparations for a warlike struggle. Then the concerted Powers proclaimed a blockade of the ports of Crete, and even went so far as to send a combined and considerable force to occupy the island itself. The immediate result was something very like open

war. A considerable body of Greek irregular troops entered Crete, and engagements actually took place between them and the Turkish forces. The Turks were more numerous and more strong, and, as we all know, Turkish troops are capable of maintaining a splendid fight when brought to the edge of battle, and in this instance they succeeded in driving the Greek troops back into the territory of Greece. The Ottoman Government thereupon formally declared war against the Cretan insurgents and against all who might come to support them. Much fighting took place, and the courage of Greeks and Turks was well displayed. But the Greek and Cretan forces were not equal to the strength of their antagonists, and the Turks were the victors here, there, and everywhere. The King of Greece meantime had done his best by dismissing one set of Ministers whom he believed to be ineffective and calling another group of men into office, but there could be no doubt that if the Greeks and the Cretans were left to their own resources the only possible result of the immediate struggle must be the victory of the Ottoman Power. It may be taken for granted that the Greek race never would, under any conditions, submit patiently to the domination of the Turks even if they had to fight as long for a chance of obtaining their national independence as the Dutch had in their endeavour to free themselves from their thralldom to Spain. While any Greek race maintained a home in Europe it was certain that

the Greek race would maintain an unceasing antagonism to Turkish rule. But it was evident that in the crisis with which we are now dealing the Greeks of the kingdom and of the Cretan islands could not, if left to their own resources, hold out very long in embattled resistance to the forces of the Sultan, and that Greece must depend on the help of some stronger Power if her uprising were to be crowned by success.

The student of history who now looks back upon the Greek crisis may see clearly enough that there was one course, and one course only, by which the concerted Powers might have settled the whole question, might have enabled Greece and Crete to become one, might have secured the future safe development and prosperity of the Greek race, and saved Europe from an often-recurring cause of international disturbance. The policy which the European Powers ought to have pursued was to declare directly and positively that if Crete really desired by the voices of her Christian populations to be made part of the kingdom of Greece, and if Greece desired the union, the Greek race must have its will, and if Turkey would not consent to make this concession to the principles of Christianity and civilisation, the great European Powers would have to enforce their terms on Turkey. There could have been no serious idea that Turkey would venture to undertake an armed struggle against England, France, Italy, Germany, and Russia. Thus the whole Greek question might

have been settled without any further effusion of blood instead of remaining for settlement as it does to this very day. The Powers chose to bring their pressure to bear much more directly on the Greeks than on the Turks, and what with the victories obtained by the regular embattled Turkish troops over the Greek irregulars, and the persistent influence exercised by the concerted Powers over the Greek Government, it was at last arranged that Greece should withdraw her men and her ships from Crete on condition that autonomy were secured for the island. The European Powers thereupon obtained from the Turkish Government an armistice which was to last while negotiations for a peaceful settlement were going on.

A preliminary treaty of peace was signed on September 1897. Not many of the details of this treaty have much living interest for readers of the present day. Some of the articles are taken up with mere arrangements as to the delimitations of the territories and the establishment of new frontier lines between Greece and Turkey, arrangements which were to be made by a commission of delegates from the two contracting Powers with military delegates from the Embassies of the great European States engaged in the carrying out of this contract. Then there was an arrangement that Greece was to pay to Turkey a large war indemnity, and here too an international commission made up of one representative from each of the

intervening Powers was to get to work in Athens. One of the clauses of this treaty presents itself at this day in a somewhat satirical and even grotesque form. Its proclaimed purpose is to secure not Greek residents against the Turk, but Turkish residents against the Greek. The idea would appear to have been that a great number of Mussulmans would flow into Crete, or into the kingdom of Greece from Turkish territories, and that the European Powers felt bound to secure these innocent strangers from any barbarities or capricious exactions which might be put upon them by the Greeks—the Greeks who may be described, on the whole, as the most educated people in Europe.

The treaty declared that the state of war between Turkey and Greece was to come to an end as soon as the peace preliminaries had been signed. The evacuation of Thessaly was to take place immediately after, and normal relations between Turkey and Greece were then to be resumed. In the event of disagreements between Turkey and Greece during the negotiations the points of dispute were to be submitted to the arbitration of the representatives of the great Powers at Constantinople, whose decisions were to be compulsory on Turkey or Greece. The Treaty left many important arrangements still to be made with regard to the supposed settlement of Crete as an autonomous island under the suzerainty of the Porte, and except for the declaration of the Powers that

Crete ought to be autonomous the conditions of things remained very much as it had been up to that time. There were still frequent and almost incessant encounters going on between the Cretan insurgents and the Turkish Bashi-Bazouks which the British forces and the Turkish garrisons were unable wholly to suppress. Russia and France joined in the proposal that Prince George of Greece should be appointed Governor-General of the island, but Austria and Turkey alike protested against this proposition, and Germany declined to take any part one way or the other. The Concert in fact was coming to an end, and in the early part of 1898 both Germany and Austria withdrew their military and naval forces from Cretan waters, and the European Concert was thus left to consist of England, France, Russia, and Italy. These Powers endeavoured to obtain an arrangement with the Cretan Assembly in order to set up the Government for the present control of the inner parts of the island under the rule of the Assembly itself, while the coast towns were still to be protected as before by the forces which the Admiral of the allied Powers commanded.

The unsatisfactory and insufficient character of these attempts to bring about a settlement led at last to a raging outbreak of the Bashi-Bazouks in the island which ended in the massacre of several hundreds of the Christians, and in this outbreak many British officers, soldiers, and sailors were killed or severely wounded. Then the British

Admiral took the matter into his own hands, and the town where the massacres were perpetrated had to be bombarded by the English war-vessels before anything like peace could be brought about. The British Admiral sent an ultimatum to the Ottoman Governor insisting on the disarmament of the Mussulman inhabitants and the removal of the Turkish troops. The firmness of the English Admiral proved too much for the Turkish Government and his demands were finally accepted. The principal leaders in the Mussulman outbreak were arrested and passed over to the Admiral's jurisdiction, but the disarmament of the Mussulman population was only carried out in a very languid and perfunctory fashion. Then the four Powers which now represented the European Concert came to an agreement that an ultimatum should be sent to the Porte insisting on the withdrawal of the Turkish troops and officials from Crete within one month from the date of the ultimatum, while the four Powers undertook to provide by their own forces full security for the lives and properties of the Mussulman population in the island. The ultimatum further announced that if the Porte should either refuse this demand or delay acquiescence beyond the specified time, the Powers would immediately have recourse to any measure necessary to carry out their decision. The Ottoman Government had no alternative but to accept these terms subject to the condition that one Turkish military post should be allowed to remain in Crete,

merely as a symbol of Turkish suzerainty and not as a centre or basis for any exercise of Turkish force. Under these conditions the evacuation of the island by the Turkish troops was practically accomplished, and the Admirals of the allied Powers assumed, for the time, the maintenance of peace in Crete. Russia now again came to the front and put forward her proposal for the appointment of Prince George of Greece as High Commissioner of the Powers in Crete, and not, as before suggested, as Governor-General of the island. England, France, and Italy accepted this proposal, and the Porte could do nothing but accept it also with more or less show of good-will and good intention. The Greek insurgents in Crete appear to have thought that there was nothing better for them to do than to accept the proposal likewise, and they accordingly laid down their arms and expressed their thanks to the European Powers for the success, thus far, of their interference in the cause of order. The Cretans on the whole were well pleased at the arrangement which, by giving them a Greek Prince as their ruler for the present, even though he were to appear only as the High Commissioner of foreign Powers, thus linked their island if but symbolically with the kingdom of Greece.

It may be worth while to set out here the principal conditions under which this new system of rule was to be established. The terms of the appointment declared that the High Commissioner was to be endowed with full powers for

three years to pacify Crete and organise a satisfactory system of Government there, while it was carefully stipulated that the Commissioner was to recognise the sovereign rights of the Sultan in Crete. The first care of the High Commissioner, it was stated, shall be 'to establish an autonomous Government in accord with the popular Assembly, such Administration to guarantee the safety of life and property as well as the religious freedom of all Cretans without distinction of creed.' The High Commissioner was to proceed at once to the creation of a gendarmerie or local militia, the business of which was to be the maintenance of order in the island. The Concert of the Powers undertook to provide the necessary means 'for the initial organisation of the Administration of the island.' Prince George now made his appearance in Crete, and was received with natural enthusiasm by the Greek population, and also, it was said at the time, by a large proportion of the Mussulmans. It is likely enough that many of the Mussulmans were ready to welcome any promise for the restoration of order, and any High Commissioner or authorised personage who could prevent some of the inhabitants of Crete from flying at the throats of the others. The blockade maintained by the European Powers was formally raised shortly before the arrival of Prince George, and the Admirals with their fleets left the Cretan waters on December 26, 1898, a few days after his coming. Just before sailing away from the scene of so much excitement the Admirals issued

a farewell proclamation to the Cretans, some passages of which have still a distinct historical interest. The proclamation stated that the Governments of Great Britain, Italy, France, and Russia had confided to Prince George of Greece the mandate of High Commissioner in Crete. 'In accepting that mandate,' the proclamation went on to say, 'which will have a duration of three years, his Royal Highness Prince George has recognised the suzerainty of his Imperial Majesty the Sultan, and has entered into the engagement to take measures to safeguard the Turkish flag, which will float only over one of the fortified points of the island.' It was then probably thought necessary to give a distinct assurance to the Cretans that the maintenance of the Turkish suzerainty and of the Turkish flag did not mean the maintenance of the Turkish system, and it was accordingly announced that 'the first care of the High Commissioner is to be in accord with the National Assembly, in which all the Cretan elements will be represented, to institute a system of autonomous Government capable of assuring equally the safety of persons and property and the free exercise of all religious beliefs.'

With the settlement of Prince George as the High Commissioner of Crete and the raising of what may be described as the protectorate blockade we may bring to a close this part of our story. It has been told at some length because of the important position occupied during the whole of the crisis by the British Government and also because

of the serious controversy ever since going on as to whether England might not have exerted beneficially to the interests of Greece and to her own lasting influence in Europe a more determined and powerful control over the whole of the arrangements. One can well understand why the Government of a country like Great Britain, a country in which there always has been during recent generations a considerable political party distinctly opposed to intervention in foreign affairs, should have made up its mind not to attempt any confederation with France, Germany, Italy, and Russia for the diplomatic settlement of the affairs of Crete. One can understand also that a State like Great Britain, proclaiming itself a lover of civil and religious freedom, should have entered into such an alliance with the avowed purpose of rescuing the Greek population of Crete from the tyranny of the Ottoman Government. But it would have been impossible for any one to suppose at the time that a federation in which England had to take part on equal terms with France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Russia could be likely to agree as to any measures having for their object the final and forcible redemption of a small Greek island from the power of a long-established and autocratic Imperial system. During the negotiations it became apparent, only too soon, that the concerted Powers were not by any means in thorough concert even as to the limited sort of reforms they were endeavouring to carry out. England, France, Italy, and Russia were left to

deal as best they might with the crisis in Crete, and Crete did at least gain something by their efforts.

The one clear lesson of the crisis is that the Greeks will never give up their principle of nationality, and it must be admitted that there is not in Europe a race more capable and on the whole better educated. Wherever the Greeks settle they make themselves most useful and successful workers in every community and in every field of work.

The author of these volumes once conversed with a Liverpool man of great influence in mercantile and political affairs on the subject of the invariable success which the Greeks who settle in this country make in all manner of mercantile and other civil occupations. The Liverpool man promptly said that an explanation of this was to be found in the fact that the Greek was quick at the mastery of foreign languages and that he never got drunk. Probably this explanation did not exhaust the subject, but it certainly went a long way towards supplying an answer to the question. The typical Greek is always a man of intelligence, of adaptability and of education, and in the competition for success in the business of life he is sure to find recognition for his remarkable qualities. Every one who has been in Greece and has studied the life and character of the people must have seen that there is among the Greeks no absolutely illiterate class, no indolence and no beggary. Even the Turkish power which has done so much to efface or corrupt the best qualities of the popu-

lations over whom it exerts its destructive sway has never been able quite to denationalise its Greek subjects. Then again there is among the Greeks no natural craving for territorial extension, no passion for what we have lately taken to calling Imperialism, which is such a disturbing force in some European States. It may be asserted without fear of contradiction—at least of any contradiction which is more than the mere assertion of a negative—that if Crete and the other Greek populations still under the suzerainty of the Porte had been allowed to attach themselves to the modern Greek kingdom at the time of its formation, the new kingdom thus formed would have soon become thriving, prosperous, and peaceful, and Europe would have been spared some ensanguined chapters of history. But the misfortune was that on no occasion did the influence of the great European Powers go far enough to ensure the recognition of Greek nationality and of its just claims. Indeed it may well be doubted whether the influence of these Powers did not sometimes work in a decidedly wrong direction. When the Greeks got rid of their King Otto, there was ample evidence to show that the Grecian people as a whole would have gladly set themselves free from all efforts at the foundation of a monarchy and would have established a republican form of Government. The great Powers, however, declined to favour any such suggestion, and acted apparently on the assumption that there would be something unseemly and improper in the idea of encouraging

any further intrusion of republicanism into Europe. The European Powers would only patronise, and would only set up, a Government having a King at its head and a King chosen from one of the families of long-established and respectable royalty. The idea of setting up a Greek Sovereign—that is to say, a Sovereign of Greek nationality and birth—does not appear to have presented itself as a matter of serious consideration to any of the Powers. As Greece must have a new King, it was assumed out of hand that the new King must be found in some Royal family. It will be remembered that the Greeks themselves, accepting without futile struggle this article in the European code, were desirous to have an English Prince allotted to them as their Sovereign. Prince Alfred of England, afterwards Duke of Edinburgh, was the choice of the Greek representatives, but it appeared that even if that Prince had been willing to accept the responsibility of the position the general conditions of European diplomacy did not favour the idea of a member of one of the great reigning houses being set up as a Sovereign of Greece. England herself could hardly in any case have accepted the suggestion, because England had made her influence distinctly felt in pressing on Greece the necessity of continuing to maintain the monarchical system, and the English statesmen naturally shrank from any course of action which might suggest to the outer world that England had urged Greece to accept a King in order that an English Prince might occupy the

vacant throne. It was then proposed in some diplomatic quarters that the new King of Greece should be found in the reigning family of Denmark. There seems to have been no objection anywhere to this proposal. Greece did not for herself particularly want any ruling Prince, but as she must have such a symbol of her respectability, and as she could not have the son of Queen Victoria, she thought she might as well have the Danish Prince as any other then available. The second son of the King of Denmark was selected by the general agreement of European statesmanship as a suitable King for Greece, and the arrangement was carried into effect. Thus it came about that a member of a reigning Danish family was appointed High Commissioner for Crete when European diplomacy shrank from going so far as to allow the Cretans to annex themselves to the Greek kingdom.

In all these arrangements the first fact which strikes the student of history is that the European Powers which undertook to manage the affairs of the Greek kingdom and the Greek island seem to have very rarely given the interests of Greece herself the first place in their consideration. England, under the inspiration of Mr. Gladstone, had acted towards Greece in the case of the Ionian Islands most generously and wisely, and as we have already noticed there was ever throughout the British Islands a widespread popular sympathy with the claims and the hopes of Greece. But it usually happened, even with English statesmanship, that

when a settlement had to be made in Grecian affairs the national wishes of the Greeks were treated as subservient to the established usages of monarchy and diplomacy. Therefore the kingdom of Greece has a Sovereign imported from Denmark, and the Cretan Island has a High Commissioner chosen from the same Danish Royal family, representing not the Greek people but the suzerainty of the Ottoman Porte. So the arrangement has gone on up to the present day, and although Europe has lately been hearing some complaints as to the deportment of the Danish High Commissioner, there has been no decided attempt made thus far at a national uprising against the established order of things. No one in the Greek kingdom or in Crete, we venture to believe, entertains for a moment the idea that the diplomatic settlement is destined to have a permanent endurance, and the first great European convulsion will probably lead to a full realisation of Greek national union and independence. The final verdict of history will, we feel assured, be that the European Powers lost a great opportunity in 1897 of bringing the whole trouble to an end and settling the Greek question once for all. In the meantime it becomes more and more apparent that Greece is living Greece once more, and that the long existing national aspirations of Greeks everywhere for a united and independent Greece under whatever form of Government can only end in the accomplishment of that great and honourable victory.

CHAPTER III.

EMPLOYER AND WORKMAN.

THE Parliamentary and indeed the whole public life of these countries was marked during the later years of Queen Victoria's reign by continuous efforts towards the improvement of the conditions under which the working-classes had to make their struggle for existence. Much of this quickened interest in their condition was due, it must be owned, to the working-classes themselves. There never had been wanting the generous and persevering efforts of individual philanthropists belonging to the upper classes to make the life of the working-man as smooth and prosperous as sympathy, brotherly love, and the spirit of reform could make it. Some of the greatest statesmen of our days voluntarily and patiently gave up a large part of their time and their work to an effort after improvements in our legislation which would lead towards the desired result. Such efforts had for a long time been made merely in the spirit of charity and sympathy, efforts for which those who made them could expect no immediate return but

that given by their own consciences and by the approval of the enlightened among their own contemporaries. But the working-men of these countries were now making their influence tell with systematic effect on Parliament and on the public at large. Organisations of working-men began to be established all over these Islands, as they were beginning to be established in many countries abroad, for the purpose of creating such thorough union of the operative classes as must make it necessary for political leaders and political parties to take account of their claims and their movements.

Union among the working orders had been long regarded with dread and dislike by many among the classes who control the business of Parliamentary legislation. The reign of Queen Victoria was far advanced before the working-man became recognised as a personage whose influence would have to be taken into account in the movements of political parties. We can most of us remember the time when a working-class member in the House of Commons was regarded as a sort of interesting curiosity, and there was a time not very long before when the conditions of our laws denied to an ordinary working-man the needful qualification for a seat in the Imperial Parliament. That property qualification had been abolished before there existed any practical likelihood that a working-man could obtain a seat in the House of Commons. Such a man might

no longer be disqualified by law from taking a seat in the House if he could obtain a number of votes at an election large enough to put him at the head of the poll. Political reform soon and almost suddenly came about in that direction also. The political franchise was extended at length to something approaching nearly to manhood suffrage, or at least to the principle of household suffrage, however poor the house might be, and to such an extension of the lodger franchise as did not preclude any grown man, not otherwise disqualified, from giving his vote at an election even if he did not occupy a house of his own.

The result of these reforms was that the votes of working-men began to be regarded as an element of the gravest importance in the election for a Parliamentary constituency. If a great struggle were coming on between the representatives of the two Parliamentary parties it was soon made apparent that the result must in many places depend absolutely on the votes of the working-men. It might happen at the time that some measure was under public discussion which directly involved the interests of the working-classes and had nothing necessarily to do with the proclaimed principles of existing Liberalism or existing Toryism. The candidates at an election knew beforehand that if the constituency were one in which the votes of the two political parties were about equally divided the victory would probably lie with the candidate who could pledge his support to some

measure directly concerning the interests of the operative classes. It therefore became inevitable that the support of the working-men voters must be counted as one of the elements to be taken into serious consideration by the political parties. The next step in this movement of progress was the resolve of working-men to bring forward members of their own fraternity as candidates for seats in the House of Commons. A distinct impression was made on the public mind when in February 1874 two working-men, Alexander Macdonald and Thomas Burt, were elected to represent two English constituencies in the House of Commons. That event proved to be the opening of a new era. The number of working-men elected to the House of Commons grew steadily at the general elections.

We have seen that the presence and action of even a very small number of men who have one great object in view and can give to it their united and constant support must have an important effect on the business of Parliament. We have seen how the famous Fourth Party, a party of only four members, one of whom was the late Lord Randolph Churchill, was able for years to make itself formidable to each of the two great parties as occasion required. But that vigorous little party, however active and however well suited for effective Parliamentary debate, had not one common principle of action to which its main efforts were to be devoted. The party led at one time by the late Charles Stewart Parnell numbered in its early

days only some eight or nine members, and yet with their principle of united action they were able to make themselves an important element in the working, or, at all events, in the obstruction of Parliamentary business. It may be taken for granted that a party determined on systematic obstruction and having also a common cause, which is recognised as legitimate and fair even if remote, must become an object of consideration to all who are concerned in supporting the existing Administration and to all who are ambitious of forming an Administration of their own. The party led by Mr. Parnell grew in numbers until at last it could bring some ninety votes into either division lobby, and it soon became an important element in the Parliamentary life of these countries.

The working-men representatives in the House of Commons had no such severe struggles to go through, and were never regarded with the dislike and dread which the majority of the House felt for the Irish Nationalists. But as they grew in numbers, and as their action was always united on questions concerning the welfare of their fraternity, they began to be recognised as men whose movements would have to be taken into account by the leaders and managers of the Liberals and the Tories alike. The working-men in the House of Commons knew well that they had behind them the support of their whole order outside the walls of Parliament. Frequent congresses of work-

ing-men were held in England, and international congresses of the same order in many Continental and American cities. Resolutions concerning the policy to be pursued for the interests of the labouring classes were carefully discussed at these meetings, and resolutions were adopted determining the course to be taken in Parliament. Therefore the working-men who sat in the House of Commons were always authoritatively informed as to the action which their brotherhood believed to be necessary for the promotion of their common welfare. There might be only a dozen men in the House of Commons who actually belonged to the operative order, but every member of the House knew that behind and supporting that small force there stood the whole working population of Great Britain and Ireland. The candidate for a constituency at an occasional election, and the candidates for all the constituencies at the General Election, soon understood that a man's chance of success might very often depend on the manner in which his political career had recommended or was likely to recommend him to the support of the working-men who had votes.

Gradually it came to be that the House of Commons contained at least four distinct parties. There were the Liberals, there were the Conservatives, there were the Irish Nationalists, and there were the representatives of Labour. It must be remembered, too, that while many Conservatives, and not a few even among the Liberals,

were so distinctly and definitely opposed on principle to the concession of Home Rule for Ireland that they could not give it their support, there were, on the other hand, hardly any questions brought up in the interests of the working-classes against which it was possible for any sincere Liberal or Tory to maintain an opinion so definite and distinct. The interests of capital and labour are no doubt always in a certain sense antagonistic, but at the same time no one will get up in the House of Commons and boldly declare that he is opposed to some measure merely because he is a capitalist and objects to anything which claims to promote the rival interests of labour. The men who sit in the House of Commons as labour representatives have never shown themselves the votaries of socialism or anarchism or the opponents of the prosperity and legitimate interests of the employing class. Moreover, the character and the Parliamentary capacity of the working-men elected to the House of Commons have always told well for the common interests of the operative classes. Many of these men prove themselves able and well-informed debaters, willing to recognise the fact that the working of their cause must be influenced by a general spirit of reasonable compromise. The vague alarm which some members belonging to the capitalist order felt at first when labour representation in the House began to be a recognised part of its composition soon cooled down and subsided as the working-men represen-

tatives showed more and more that they had no projects in hand for the upset of all existing social arrangements. More than one working-man was admitted to office in a Government, and the working-men thus promoted always proved themselves equal to their Administrative duties. The supposed antagonism between capital and labour soon lost its terrors and proved itself an unreality and even a superstition as the working-men grew to be more numerous and effective in the House of Commons. The effect of all this on the working of Parliament and on the mind of the general public became increasingly hopeful for the true interests of capital and labour alike. Every Government, whether Tory or Liberal, soon got into the way of proclaiming its interest in the condition of the working-classes and in promoting measures which might relieve those classes from the disadvantages imposed upon them through generations, and even through centuries, by narrow-minded and oppressive legislation.

At one time this or that class of operatives had no protection against unreasonable action on the part of the employers except such as was given to them by the rough-and-ready operation of a "strike." The strikes were almost always denounced by some of the capitalists and by their supporters in the newspaper press as wild, reckless, and even criminal, and it was insisted on by such speakers and writers that the working-man by his outrageous conduct was only bringing

worse calamity upon his family and his class. It used to be commonly asked in those days whether any rational working-man could really believe that he was helping his family by taking a course which deprived them of their daily bread and threatened to leave them with no home but the Workhouse. In many of these cases the working-men had no other weapons with which to defend themselves and their families than those furnished by the passive resistance of the strike. No body of employers, however wealthy or powerful, could regard with indifference the prospect of having their whole business brought to a temporary stop by the refusal of the operatives to work any longer on the old conditions. The capitalists might be able to win in the end and to enforce their own terms because of the ample resources which enabled them to hold out to the last, and by reason of the fact that it was with them a struggle for the maintenance of what they believed to be reasonable profits, and not a struggle for the maintenance of life. But a wide-spreading strike was always an event likely to give pause to the energy of the most determined and uncompromising capitalist, and it compelled him at least to stop and think whether it would not be more for his interest to consider the question as impartially as might be, and to see whether the prosperity of both classes would not be better served by the capitalists making some concession towards the demands of the worker.

One very important effect brought about by

these strikes and the questions which they made prominent was that the public in general began to think the whole matter carefully over, and soon gave up the long cherished idea that a strike was only an evidence of the working-man's undisciplined selfishness, another proof that nothing could be done with him unless he were kept well in control by his employers and by the Imperial Parliament. Thus there gradually came to be in the House of Commons and outside an increasing number of educated and influential men who were well inclined to sympathise with the working-men, who could see that there were at least two sides to every question in dispute between capital and labour, and were neither disposed to admit the idea that every man engaged in a strike must be an anarchist nor to accept the theory that every capitalist must be a tyrant. Men of this order, members of the House of Lords as well as of the House of Commons, made themselves prominent and made themselves also very useful by their efforts to give good advice on both sides of the controversy and their willingness to mediate between the disputants. The working of the principle of mediation came to be recognised and accepted as the only practical and satisfactory means for obtaining a settlement in each great dispute. On the expansive field where capital and labour must either co-operate or fight out a wasting war there was already going on something like that growth of healthy opinion

which was to be observed among the international conferences of working-men.

There was at this time among civilised nations an almost passionate yearning beginning to develop itself for the settlement of great disputes by peaceful arbitration rather than by the rude, capricious, and unenduring arbitrament of the battle-field. At all times in the history of the world it had occasionally been found necessary, when a great war was over, for the victors and the vanquished to accept the suggestions of neutral powers with regard to the final terms of settlement. But in recent years there had grown in all civilised countries a strong anxiety for the recognition and development of some principle and some course of action which should make the consideration of a satisfactory settlement to an international dispute precede and not follow the operations of war. We have in very recent years seen the establishment of great international congresses for the express purpose of settling disputes as far as possible by peaceful arbitration and not by war. Not much has yet come in practice of these civilised tribunals, but the fact of their existence and their recognition by the great civilised States may be taken as a hopeful augury for the coming, and the near coming, of a better and a brighter era in history when an appeal to arms will only be the final movement in a dispute admitting of no settlement by peaceful arbitration. We may

surely hope that disputes which admit no settlement on the grounds of reason and of justice will be rare events in the progress of mankind.

To return to our immediate subject, we may say that the disputes between capital and labour are already coming to be universally regarded as questions capable of final and satisfactory settlement by the decision of impartial arbitration. It must be admitted that the remarkable progress made of recent years towards such a condition is in great measure due to the intelligence, the perseverance, and, on the whole, the moderation of the operatives themselves and the intelligent men of their own order who lead them in their organised movements and represent them in the House of Commons.

Some of the working-men who have seats in the House won for themselves a high reputation, and are regarded with respect and confidence by all parties. Mr. John Burns, for instance, was elected as a member of the London County Council as well as of the House of Commons. He had received his education for the most part at night schools, where he studied when his day's work was done, as he had from his very boyish years to work hard for his living. His occupation was that of a working engineer, but from his earliest years he had an intense love for reading, and he thus made himself acquainted with some of the great masters of literature. As a young man he worked for some time as foreman engineer in a steamer on

the Niger, and it may not be unimportant to our theme to say that while in West Africa he was commonly known among his compatriot fellow-workmen by the nickname of "Coffee-Pot Burns" because of his fixed teetotal principles, and his objection to the use of any more fiery liquid than that which came from the harmless coffee-pot. After he returned to England with some savings in his pocket, savings which were no doubt all the greater because of his temperate habits, he treated himself to the gratification of a desire which had possessed him from his boyhood. He spent six months in a tour through most of the countries of Continental Europe, and we may be sure that nothing he looked upon in his travels was lost upon his observant eyes and his intelligent spirit. He was always much interested in public movements and public meetings, and he gradually became known as at once a powerful and a persuasive speaker. He took a part, and a leading part, in many important organisations of working-men, and even in great strikes, and in these his influence was twofold—it promoted perseverance toward the attainment of the objects sought by his class, and at the same time moderation and fair-play in the methods by which those objects were to be attained.

Naturally John Burns soon attracted the attention of the labouring classes everywhere, and as the election of working-men to the House of Commons had come to be a recognised incident in public life, he was invited to stand as a candidate

for the representation of Battersea. He was elected for that constituency in 1892. He proved himself in the House of Commons a most effective debater. He had a powerful voice, a ready command of words, a happy faculty for the array of appropriate argument, and he spoke only on questions that he thoroughly understood. A man with the fluency of John Burns, and with his love for public speaking, might easily have been led to mar his influence in the House of Commons by speaking too often and at too great length. The very sincerity and intensity of the interest he took in so many public questions might naturally have led him to present himself too often in debate. But unlike many other men gifted with an eloquent tongue and strong convictions, John Burns seems never to have felt any temptation towards unnecessary display of his eloquence, or, if he ever did feel such temptation, appears to have been well able to resist it. He only took part in a debate when he had something to say which bore directly on the subject, and was suggested to him by his own practical acquaintance with the question under dispute. The House soon understood this peculiarity, and knew that if John Burns rose and claimed the attention of the Speaker it must be because he had information to impart and arguments to put forward which other members of the House would not be likely to have at their command. A man who wins for himself such a character in the House of Commons is

always sure to find a welcome there. The House knows that he will not try to speak unless he has something to say, and that he will not occupy any longer time than is needed for him to say it.

Notwithstanding what must have seemed to most members of the House the extreme opinions held by Burns on many subjects, there was nothing about him of the Anarchist or even of the Socialist, according to the common interpretation of that word. He had been brought more than once into collision with recognised authorities during his active career as a leader of working-men. On one occasion he vindicated the right of public meeting in Trafalgar Square in very practical fashion, and actually underwent six weeks' imprisonment for resisting the police. But during all experience of public and political agitation it has occasionally happened that some champion of a popular cause has allowed himself to be drawn into a course of action for the maintenance of what he believes to be the right, which ends in his being brought before the magistrates and sentenced to fine and imprisonment. The House of Commons knows well how to appreciate this sort of resistance to the law, and does not set down a man as an enemy to social order merely because he has got into a contest with the police while endeavouring to maintain the right of public meeting. John Burns took a leading part in the great strike of the dockers which disturbed and perturbed London in 1889. At one time much dread was felt lest that

momentous strike might lead to serious disturbance in those regions of London where the riverside workers abound, or in Hyde Park and other public places where great meetings are held. But the whole crisis was brought at last to a peaceful and satisfactory end, and we may feel assured that the practical good sense and well-applied influence of John Burns did much to accomplish that result. Much was unquestionably due to the friendly, judicious, and persevering efforts made by Cardinal Manning, Sir John Lubbock, and others who intervened in the dispute to secure a full and patient hearing for the case of the strikers.

The part taken by John Burns in this great discussion was well calculated to raise his character in the estimation of the capitalist as well as in that of the labourer, and it certainly must have done much to banish from even the most prejudiced mind the idea that he was an Anarchist, a champion of the doctrine that property is robbery, or even a setter of class against class. The House of Commons soon understood that John Burns was a valuable contributor to all discussions which brought up the claims of the working-classes, and that a representative chamber without men of his order to take part in its debates could not be regarded as an exponent of public opinion in such a country as England. It soon came to be recognised as a settled condition in the effective working of the British Constitution

that there must always be in the House of Commons a certain number of men elected to that House with the special mission and duty of representing the views and the claims of the working-classes on all subjects connected with the manufacturing and trading interests of the Empire.

The peaceful, orderly, and moderate character of those claims was made apparent to the world as the number of representatives of the working-classes increased. The idea of associating anarchy or destructive social revolution with those classes soon faded out of the public mind. It is a curious fact that one well-known working-man, Mr. Tom Mann, who had been associated with John Burns during the strike of the dock labourers, was in May 1897 ordered to leave France within twenty-four hours, and forbidden to speak at any public meeting in that country—on the ground that he was a dangerous Anarchist or Socialist. Mr. Mann had been invited to speak at what was described as a Socialist meeting in Paris, and the authorities assumed that a man with such views must be an intolerable danger in a French community. Mr. Mann belonged, no doubt, to many associations which advocated what were called Socialistic views, but if the men holding authority in Paris had only allowed him to speak in public they would have learned that the Socialism he advocated did not identify itself with any violent revolutionary upheavings of Society, but sought merely to propound plans for the removal of the

legalised difficulties which interfered with the honest and reasonable claims of the operative class to a fair share in the prosperity of the country.

There was a time when the views which John Burns afterwards advocated with such wholesome effect in the House of Commons would have been regarded by many of the capitalist order as opposed to the best traditions and interests of Conservatism, and therefore dangerous to the whole established order of things. Probably the men who held this belief might have entertained just the same idea with regard to many passages in the writings of John Stuart Mill, if only these passages had been read out to them without the name of their author being given. We are only concerned to emphasise the fact that the House of Commons and the public in general soon came to understand that John Burns and his colleagues in the representation of the working-class were no more the enemies of Society at large than the great political economist and moralist whose name has just been mentioned, and who taught the doctrine that economic science called for some fundamental alterations in the legalised conditions which had long surrounded the arrangements between capital and labour.

Another distinguished representative of the working-classes who sat in the House of Commons was Mr. Thomas Burt. This rising spokesman of his order was elected as member for Morpeth at the General Election of February 1874 by an overwhelming majority of votes, his defeated oppo-

nent being the Conservative candidate. Thomas Burt, at the age of ten, began life as a worker in the coal-pits in Northumberland, where his father was a toiler of the same kind. Like John Burns, Thomas Burt developed a love and capacity for self-education which helped to make his toilsome life pass smoothly and hopefully for him. It must be remembered that during his earlier days there was no system of national education existing in England, and that the youth born to poverty who desired education must either educate himself or be content to depend on some form of charitable help if he would obtain even the rudiments of culture. Burt soon distinguished himself amongst his fellows and held office in various associations formed by the miners for their own benefit. It was thus that he became so popular among the working-classes in the North as to justify their call on him to become a candidate for the representation of Morpeth. His whole Parliamentary career has been thoroughly successful in the sense which we may assume would be most congenial with his own personal ambition.

Thomas Burt never has been, and never has attempted to be, one of the orators or even one of the great debaters who have only to rise in a debate in order to fill the House with eager listeners. He, like John Burns, only spoke when he had some information to give or some argument to offer which might otherwise have failed to reach the House. He spoke without any

attempt at eloquence, and said what he had to say in the plainest, most direct, and unadorned style. But the keen intelligence and the wide practical knowledge of the man soon impressed the House of Commons and secured him a full hearing whenever he rose to speak. It was not his speaking, therefore, which made his Parliamentary and public success. His remarkable capacity for comprehending and arranging all the various practical details belonging to the questions in which he was mainly engaged soon became known among his fellows, and by degrees made him accepted through the whole country as an authority on all subjects connected with the welfare of the working-classes. Mr. Burt became president of many important organisations for the interests of the miners, and acted as president over several international conferences held in Continental cities. He was appointed a member of some Royal Commissions organised for the purpose of inquiring into various subjects involving the interests of labour, and he was one of the delegates sent from Great Britain to an important International Labour Conference, opened in Berlin during the Spring of 1890. Not long after this event, Mr. Burt had the honour of holding office in a Liberal Administration. Mr. Gladstone, who had always a quick eye and a welcoming spirit for rising capacity, had long seen and recognised the ability of Mr. Burt, and in 1892 he offered him the position of

Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade in the Liberal Government. Mr. Burt accepted the offer and retained his official position until the General Election of 1895, when the Liberals were defeated and the Conservatives came once again into office. Mr. Burt has also shown distinct capacity as a writer, and articles from his pen have appeared in several of our leading reviews.

Another of the working-men in Parliament who held office in a Liberal Government is Mr. Henry Broadhurst. This representative of the working-class is the son of a stonemason, and received such elements of education as he was lucky enough to obtain in a small village school. During much of his early life he worked as a stonemason, but he soon made known his capacity for public speaking and for organisation, and acted as secretary to more than one society established for the promotion of the claims and interests of labour. He was invited to become a candidate for Parliament, and in 1880 obtained a seat in the House of Commons. He served, like Mr. Burt, on some Royal Commissions appointed to consider questions on the housing of the working-classes, and on reformatories and industrial schools. In 1886 he received from Mr. Gladstone the office of Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department. He has since continued, with one short interval, to hold his place as a member of the House of Commons,

and is recognised as one of its most capable and respected advocates of the cause of labour.

There are other working-men having seats in the House of Commons who have done valuable service there to every cause which they felt conscientiously bound to advocate, but in this rapid summary it is not necessary to record the names of all, or to describe in detail the services they have rendered to the welfare of their own order, and therefore to the benefit of the whole community. The main object of this chapter is to show how the working-classes of these countries have made good use of their opportunities for the election of candidates to speak for them and for their just claims in the great representative assembly of the State.

The important fact is that the representation of labour has now become one of the recognised constituent elements of the House of Commons. Every year that has passed since the first election of working-men to that assembly has more and more justified the principle which those elections have established. There is no body of members in the House who have discharged their public duties more fairly and more creditably than these Labour members, and we should find it impossible now to contemplate the existence of a House of Commons which did not contain its fair proportion of working-men. So far as actual legislation is concerned the Labour members have not yet been able to accomplish fully any of the

organic reforms which they have advocated with so much spirit, intelligence, and perseverance. Every class of reformers must know well what slow work it is to push any important and much-contested measure of reform first through the House of Commons and then through the House of Lords, but the working-men have at least opened the way for some beneficent changes which are certain to be accomplished before many years shall have passed away. We all know what a time it took, and how many changes of Government it required, before some of the political reforms now accepted as indispensable portions of our Constitution could be carried to success in spite of the determined resistance of established and hostile interests. The working-men have now a secure opportunity of explaining their claims and vindicating their cause in the House of Commons, and it is only justice to that House to say that every claim which really deserves a hearing is sure to have full recognition in course of time.

No intelligent observer can fail to be impressed by the fact that this momentous change, so pregnant of beneficent possibilities, has been brought about without convulsion of society, and without any serious disturbance of orderly administration. Throughout this long and gradual organisation of labour there has been nothing said or done by recognised representatives which could in the slightest degree tend to mark them as Anarchists,

or levellers, or fantastic social revolutionists. There have been Socialist Leagues and Socialist Unions, but the Socialism advocated by these combinations of men has nothing to do with the doctrine which is set forth as Socialism in so many Continental countries. The public in general has now almost forgotten the idea, once so widely entertained, that a movement made avowedly on behalf of the working-classes must be a movement aimed at the break-up of the whole existing social system. We see what manner of men are they whom the working-classes, wherever and whenever they had an opportunity, have deliberately and of their own accord chosen to represent them in the House of Commons. In many constituencies the working-men, and those who befriend them, possess a majority of the votes, and if they were at all inclined to advocate anarchical doctrines they would doubtless find some candidates willing to talk any manner of anarchy for the sake of starting a Parliamentary career. We can see that in no single instance have they chosen such a representative, and we know who the men are who sit as their spokesmen in the House of Commons. The working-men in Parliament do not appear to have bound themselves by any pledge of united action on subjects which do not concern the interests of their own class. They are free to hold their individual opinions on other questions and to vote accordingly, and are none the less regarded as trusted and faith-

ful exponents of the cause and the interests they were elected to advocate.

Every intelligent Englishman, whatever his social order, must regard with satisfaction the practical progress made in the cause of labour and the character of the men whom labour has sent to be its representatives in the House of Commons. We have no intention of suggesting that the working-classes have been invariably fortunate in their choice of candidates, or that their chosen representatives have always proved themselves models of discretion and political judgment. We do not see how there could be any system of Parliamentary representation if it were to be a condition for the retention of such a privilege by any class of constituencies that they should never select any representatives who were not models of intelligence, public spirit, and good behaviour. Some few years ago there was a great deal of scornful and angry comment, both written and spoken, on the fact that one chosen representative of the working-class had made his entrance into the House of Commons as an elected member accompanied by a triumphant procession and a brass band as far as the precincts of Westminster Hall. But there have been occasions also when equally unbecoming proclamations of triumph were performed in a like proximity to the House of Commons by successful candidates from highly select constituencies where the vote of the working-classes would have counted for nothing.

The one unquestionable fact is that, taken as a body, the working-men in the House of Commons have conducted themselves, even so far as deportment is concerned, with as much propriety and regard for order as could have been shown by any other section of members. We have not had for many years any serious disturbances arising out of the disputes between capital and labour, and beyond doubt the main reason why those disputes have not led to more serious troubles is to be found in the fact that the working-classes began more and more to recognise the value and the virtue of that Parliamentary representation which was at last, and even then so slowly, measured out to them.

The free and fair working out of the representative principle is one of the very greatest securities a State can have for the maintenance of good order. Give a man a grievance against which he is not permitted to make a public plea or to hold an open argument, and you convert that man into a midnight conspirator and an enemy of existing laws. By applying the same process to many men you create bands of Anarchists willing and ready to strive after any change, no matter how desperate and how indefinite, provided it promises the upset of existing institutions. Allow to the same man or same men a free and full opportunity of open discussion, and the hope of convincing their opponents by argument will be enough to fill them with that confidence

which is the best security for all social institutions. The greatest enemy of secret conspiracy is freedom of speech. Slow as are the working processes of our Parliamentary mechanism, many as are the delays set in the way of enlightened progress by class interest and social prejudices, yet it is now accepted as a fact, as indeed the leading fact in our political system, that if the demand for some legislative improvement is well founded and fair it only needs full Parliamentary and public discussion to secure its success. The working-classes of these Islands are on the whole patient and orderly. Although they know they may have to wait too long for the remedy of some grievance, they also know that persistent debate and reasonable argument will secure to them sooner or later the judgment of public opinion. The passing of such legislation as public opinion may demand will secure to them every fair opportunity of disposing of their labour to the best advantage, and of thus feeling that they are recognised as free citizens of a great and prosperous State.

The lesson already learned by the people of these countries is that the Labour members sent into the House of Commons by the choice and the vote of labour itself have proved in every way worthy of the place assigned to them, and are likely to form one of the most efficient barriers against that disturbance of social order which in cruder days of public opinion was too commonly

set down as the most dreaded danger to social order and to the welfare of the Empire. The working-classes have, during these later years, given ample evidence of their moderation, their intelligence, their capacity for reasonable discussion, and their representation in the House of Commons will be ever regarded as one of the most beneficent improvements in our legislative system accomplished during Queen Victoria's reign. For the first time in our history the Parliamentary representative chamber may be regarded as in the true sense the House of Commons.

Much of the Session of 1897 was occupied with the discussion and carrying of the measure entitled the Workmen's Compensation for Accidents Act. This measure, or at least some measure adopting the same principle, had during several previous years been familiar to the House of Commons. The idea was that Parliament ought to pass an Act entitling working-men to compensation for personal injuries caused by accidents during their working time, accidents which were not to be attributed to any negligence or other fault on the part of the sufferers themselves. A Bill for this purpose was brought in and passed for seven years as a sort of experiment in 1880. The Bill was, however, very limited in its scope, and much qualified in its application to the grievance of which working-men complained. It appears to have had no effect in protecting the operatives from or in securing them compensation

for injuries inflicted on them by accidents which better care on the part of the employers might have foreseen and prevented. A new Act having the same object was passed in 1888, which seems also to have been almost altogether unsatisfactory. In the early part of the Session of 1893 yet another Bill was introduced, but this, too, came to nothing. The main dispute over the provisions of the measure arose on the introduction of the clause enabling workmen and their employers to contract themselves out of the measure by mutual agreement. This clause was strongly opposed in the House of Commons on the ground that if it were passed into legislation it would enable any employers to make it a condition, preliminary to employing a workman, that he must agree to contract himself out of the application of the measure. It was contended by the Parliamentary advocates of the working-man that the operatives would often have to choose between throwing away the protection offered by the measure and obtaining no employment, for the reason that there would at all times be employers who would take good care to escape by such means from the responsibilities imposed by the new measure. The Commons finally rejected the disputed clause, but when the Bill went up to the House of Lords the clause was maintained in its original form. The whole measure was then withdrawn by the Liberal Administration.

Another Bill for the same general purpose was brought in by the Government, now that of

Lord Salisbury and the Conservatives, in the Session of 1897. During its discussion in Committee there were some new clauses introduced which led to a long debate. One of these was a clause, moved by the Home Secretary, which proposed to give to any workman injured by the act or neglect of an outsider, the right to decide for himself whether he would take proceedings against the outsider under the common law of the country, or proceed directly against his employer under the provisions of the new measure. This clause was opposed, evidently in the interest of the employers, on the ground that it was not fair or reasonable to make the employer liable in any sense for the act or the neglect of one over whom he had no direct control. The new clause, however, had the support of the Opposition, and it was finally passed by a large majority, the minority being made up for the most part of those who supported the interests of the employers.

The Government soon after made, or supported, some concessions to the employers, which were set out in new amendments. One member of the House, the head of a great ship-building firm, carried an amendment altering the time during which the claim for compensation should be made in case of death, from twelve months to six months. This would not seem to be a very serious alteration, but some of the leaders of the Opposition contended that such amendments were a breach of the com-

promise understood to have been accepted by the House in general. Some compromise, it was clear, had to be made. It was impossible to introduce any legislation which could contrive to give complete satisfaction to both employers and workmen alike. The difficulty of finding and maintaining any fair and reasonable system of compromise brought up many discussions which, read over subsequently, bewilder the reader a good deal as to the side whence the support of a particular amendment or the opposition to it might naturally be expected to come. Some members of the Opposition set themselves against amendments which seem to have been rather liberal in their application, and some followers of the Government thereupon accused these Liberals of having deserted the cause of the working-man. In the same manner some habitual supporters of the Government strongly condemned certain concessions made by the Administration, these concessions being, as was but natural, supported by leading members of the Opposition.

The Government were put in a very peculiar position. In the ordinary course of things it might be taken for granted that Lord Salisbury's Administration would have been found to act generally in support of the employers' interests, and that the Opposition would, as a rule, back up the claims of the working-men. The Government were to all appearance sincerely anxious that as much as possible should be done to re-

cognise in every way the just claims of the operatives. But the majority of the capitalists and employers of labour were on the Government side, and if the Administration did not take their demands into account, might have succeeded in throwing out the Bill altogether. Compromise is always a matter of great difficulty and delicacy in any case where special and opposing interests, the interests of one as against another class, have to be taken into consideration. One almost unavoidable result of this state of things was that the Bill had to be left without some of the most important improvements which would have to be made if the measure were intended to be anything like a final settlement of the rival claims of employers and employed. There can be no doubt that if the Government had gone too far on the side of the employers they might have endangered, for the time, the carrying of the whole measure, and there can be just as little doubt that the measure as it passed through the House of Commons was ineffective as a lasting settlement of the great dispute.

The Bill was read a third time without a division, and then sent up to the House of Lords. The members of the Upper House debated the measure at much length, and with an earnestness which is not, to put it mildly, very often to be observed in the sittings of the hereditary chamber. The Marquis of Londonderry raised strong objection to many parts of the measure although he did not directly oppose it. He accused the Government

of having introduced a Bill which, if brought in by a Liberal Administration, they would have condemned and rejected. This speech, delivered by one who was habitually a supporter of Conservative Governments, who had held and was again to hold office under a Conservative Prime Minister, supplies a fair illustration of the difficulties which so many Conservatives found in dealing with the whole proposal for the compensation of workmen. Lord Londonderry took care not to associate himself openly and directly with hostility to the principle of the measure, or to rank himself on the side of capital as against labour. But he raised every objection that could be raised to some of the provisions of the Bill; he condemned it because it was too limited in its operation, and did not take in all manner of labouring and trading industries; he condemned it sometimes none the less because it went too far in its application. But he probably judged the situation correctly enough when he said that if such a measure had been introduced by a Liberal Government the Conservatives would have taken good care that the measure should never reach the House of Lords, or, if it did, should never come out alive. On the other hand the measure received anything but enthusiastic support from such Liberals as Lord Ripon, Lord Dunraven, and Lord Kimberley. These Peers took common ground in their dealing with it. They all declined to oppose it for the plain reason that, whatever its deficiencies and faults, it was moving in the right

direction, and was at all events better than nothing. But they were clearly of opinion that sooner or later its principle would have to be broadly extended and made to apply to all industrial occupations.

The discussion in the House of Lords showed even more clearly than that in the House of Commons that both the great political parties recognised the necessity for carrying out some measure embodying the general principle set forth in the Bill, but that each party alike shrank from the danger of being supposed to go too far in carrying that principle into legislation. The speech of the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, was especially effective in combating the arguments of those among his own party who believed that the measure went too far in sustaining the operatives at the expense of the employers, and in showing how arguments of the same kind had been used to prevent the passing of several great measures of reform which had since been accepted by the whole country, and had worked with the happiest effect. At the same time Lord Salisbury was very careful not to commit himself to a large and liberal extension of that principle, and not to make anything like a full concession to the demands set up in the interests of the operative class. It will be apparent that under such conditions it was not likely that a final measure could then be passed through the House of Commons where the Conservative Government had a large majority, and would have had little chance indeed of being accepted by the

House of Lords. The Government measure was passed through both Houses and received the Royal assent on the 5th of August 1897. It was but a compromise, and even a poor compromise, between the claims of the operatives and the supposed interests of the employers, and could not possibly be regarded as a final settlement of the great question. Still it was something to have got even thus far with a strong Conservative Government in office, and the final arrangement was obviously left for future legislation. The working-men were compelled to make further efforts in order to win a more favourable hearing for their claims, and to carry the needed reform to a complete success.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DEATH OF GLADSTONE.

ASCENSION Day of 1898, which occurred on May 19, will ever be regarded as a memorable day in English history and especially in the Parliamentary life of England. On that day William Ewart Gladstone breathed his last. He died in his Hawarden home—passed away from the ever-loving and ever-devoted ministrations of the wife to whom he had been so tenderly attached and who had always been his most trusted and most affectionate companion. Since his retirement from Parliamentary leadership and from Parliamentary work Gladstone had not devoted his closing days to quietude and seclusion. Again and again some great public question, such as that which was created by the sufferings of the Armenians under Turkish rule, had aroused him into active appeals on behalf of the side for which the claims of justice and mercy were combined. The closing days of his life had been darkened by much physical suffering, by intense pain, by nervous exhaustion, by the failure of some of his physical,

although none of his intellectual, faculties, and the end had been for a long time distinctly foreseen. Those who loved him most could hardly have wished for the further prolongation of an earthly existence overshadowed and intertwined with so much of suffering. Still, when the inevitable came at last and was made known, a profound shock passed through all civilised nations. No statesman of the time had performed a greater part in history than Gladstone had done, or had won so high a place in the admiration and affection of the living world. Every one felt that he had left no equal behind him. He had gained for himself the foremost position in some of the noblest fields of human activity. He had been a great statesman, one of the greatest known to modern times; he had been an orator entitled to rank among the highest of all ages; he had been a profound student of history and of literature, a lover of poetry and all the arts, a man who understood and appreciated the discoveries and influences of modern science, and he had been a philanthropist of the purest order. The ways and the artifices which are common to statesmanship even of a high and honoured class had never been moving influences with him—his one impassioned desire from first to last had been to see the right, and, if we may quote some words of his own, ‘to follow it whithersoever it might lead.’ Even his most unyielding political opponents never believed him guilty of adopting any course for the sake of mere party interests or of taking up any cause

for the reason that it was popular, and that its advocacy might strengthen an Administration of which he was the leader.

As a Parliamentary orator and debater Gladstone never had a superior in the splendid record of British Parliamentary eloquence. Some of the greatest orators, like Edmund Burke for instance, had always to contend against the disadvantages of an ineffective delivery. Others again were great in impassioned outbursts, but were not effective in what might be called the dry details of financial exposition. Others, too, there were who, though supreme in many rhetorical gifts, were lacking in the finer sense of humour. Some, like Charles James Fox, were occasionally fitful and impulsive, and were now and then carried away by their own emotions and even by their own fluency from the direct track of the necessary argument. But Gladstone seemed to combine in himself all the requisite qualities of the great orator and debater. He had a magnificent voice, a splendid delivery, a fluency which never faltered yet never failed to find the most appropriate words, and he showed, on occasions when the question under debate gave it a fitting and telling place, a rare and happy gift of humour heightened with touches of sarcasm which were none the less successful because they never carried the sting of malignity with them.

Those who knew Gladstone personally knew best how entirely unselfish his nature was, and

how open his heart was ever to any deserving appeal. He was a most delightful talker, and there was hardly a subject in the range of human reading on which he could not converse with readiness and with full appreciation. He was filled, too, with an intense desire to increase his stock of knowledge from every available source, and he sought always to obtain from every one with whom he came into contact some addition to his already acquired treasury of information. There was a prevailing idea among those who had not known him personally that Gladstone was what is commonly known as a great talker—that he liked to keep most of the talk to himself, and did not care to give to others their fair chance of having a share in it. This impression was entirely mistaken, and certainly was not entertained by those who had been fortunate enough often to meet him in private. He loved indeed to give out his own views, but he loved also to hear what others had to say, and he was especially inclined to draw into conversation those who seemed shy or timid, to encourage and even to wile them into the expression of their own views and the relation of their own experiences, and thus to get from every one some contribution to the discussion then taking place. He never allowed himself to be regarded, as other great men of his time loved to be regarded, as an authority whose words none must dispute and the utterance of whose opinion ought of

itself to overbear and overawe all attempt at antagonism.

These were some of the guiding qualities of Gladstone's life as a public man, just as they were qualities of his life in daily social intercourse with men and women. He loved society, and gave a ready welcome to strangers who had no public claims to the attention of so great a leader of men. He must needs have known something of his own superb position in the admiration of men at home and abroad, and he must have been fully conscious that when he made one of a company most of those present were eager to hear what he might have to say and would have been all the better pleased if he had monopolised the talk. But Gladstone did not show himself in private life as one who assumed the right of dictatorship to his fellow mortals, or who conceived that his mission was to expound and theirs to listen. The terms in which it was often his way to discuss the characteristics of other public speakers showed that he had a thorough capacity for appreciating and admiring styles of eloquence wholly unlike his own, and a faculty for discerning what was best in every speaker and giving it the full tribute of praise. He was often heard to speak with enthusiasm about certain Parliamentary debaters whose style was entirely unlike his own, was wanting in all the glow of passionate eloquence which carried every assembly with it when Gladstone spoke, and was even remarkable

for a rigorous bareness of diction which only allowed for fact and argument and sought after no artistic decoration. The truth is that Gladstone had a mind of singularly expansive powers ever open to new ideas and able to recognise new forms and styles of art in literature and eloquence. It was one of his fine gifts to be capable of taking interest in almost any subject, and the latest novelty neither charmed him nor repelled him because of its novelty, as is so often the case with other men, but found in him an impartial critic with a ready gift of generous praise where praise seemed to be deserved.

Both Houses of Parliament gave generous expression to the national grief over Mr. Gladstone's death and the national feeling of admiration and reverence for his noble life. In the House of Lords the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, delivered a speech as eloquent as it was evidently sincere and heartfelt, a speech in which personal friendship was blended with political appreciation. The Peers who were present remained uncovered during the proceedings in tribute to the solemnity of the occasion. The Prime Minister expressed his belief that the one thing which would most attract the attention of foreign nations at such a time was the universal agreement of all persons, classes, and schools of thought in doing honour to the memory of a man who had been engaged more continually in political conflict than probably any other man of his generation. Lord Salisbury

went on to say that Mr. Gladstone had always sought the achievement of great ideals which could have proceeded only from the greatest and purest moral aspirations, and would leave behind him the memory of a great Christian statesman whose character, motives, and purposes could not fail to impress the whole world. Lord Salisbury summed up his panegyric by declaring that Mr. Gladstone 'would be long remembered not so much for the causes in which he was engaged, but as a great example, of which history hardly furnished a parallel, of a great Christian man.' Lord Kimberley, as leader of the Opposition and as a steadfast supporter and personal friend of Mr. Gladstone, seconded the motion, and acknowledged readily that the Prime Minister had struck the true keynote in describing the extraordinary manifestation of feeling evoked among all parties and classes by the death of Mr. Gladstone. The Duke of Devonshire spoke a few straightforward and manly sentences in associating himself unreservedly with the utterances of the two speakers who had gone before him. He said that to those who, like himself, had been compelled to separate in 1886 from the trusted leader whom they had followed so long the severance was inevitably painful, but he added that he could recall no words of Mr. Gladstone's which added unnecessary bitterness to that separation, and that none of those who had ceased to follow him ever doubted that Mr. Gladstone's action on that

occasion, as on every other during his long public life, was guided by no feeling but his sense of public duty. Lord Rosebery, too, paid an eloquent tribute to Mr. Gladstone's genius as a statesman and an orator, and to that first and most obvious feature of his character, the universality of his human sympathies. This country, Lord Rosebery said, loved brave men, and virile virtue was perhaps the quality ranked highest by Mr. Gladstone, whom no amount of opposition to any cause which he had once taken up could intimidate or turn away.

The House of Commons meeting on the day of Gladstone's death had adjourned at once as a mark of respect to the memory of its former leader, in order that no mere routine business should be done in such a place on such a day. When the House met on the following day, Mr. Balfour, as leader of the House, proposed that an address should be sent to the Crown, praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to direct that the remains of the illustrious statesman just dead should be interred at the public charge, and that a monument should be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, with an inscription expressive of the public admiration and attachment, and of the 'sense entertained of his rare and splendid gifts, and his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State,' and to assure Her Majesty that the House would make good all the expenses attending the ceremonial. Mr.

Balfour at the time was suffering from a somewhat severe illness, but he was none the less resolved to bear his leading part in the work of the day, and the effort it cost him to speak made it quite evident to all who heard him that the task was a great strain on his physical strength. It was observed, too, that Mr. Balfour read nearly all his speech from a written paper, an act which was entirely out of keeping with his usual habit as one of the most ready and fluent speakers in the House of Commons. There could be no question as to the deep sincerity of his feelings, or the struggle he had to make to keep those feelings from overmastering now and then his power of self-control. He reminded the House that during sixty years of Mr. Gladstone's life the country had gone through a series of changes, scientific, theological, social, and political, and in all those phases of contemporary evolution Mr. Gladstone had shown the liveliest interest, and had taken actual part in many of them; that in some of them the part he took was supreme, and in others was a governing and guiding influence. There was no gift, Mr. Balfour declared, which could enable a man to move, to influence, and to adorn an assembly like that of the House of Commons which Gladstone did not possess in a supereminent degree, and he described him as the greatest member of the greatest deliberative assembly the world had yet seen. Mr. Balfour admitted that there might have been debaters as ready and orators as finished

as Mr. Gladstone, and that it might have been given to others to sway as skilfully that somewhat critical assembly, or to appeal with as much directness and force to the simpler instincts of great masses of his countrymen, but he added that it had been given to no other man to combine all those great gifts as they had been combined in the person of William Ewart Gladstone. He expressed a doubt whether they could ever again have in the House of Commons a man who could livingly illustrate what Mr. Gladstone was to his contemporaries, or show to those who had never heard him how much the country and the world had lost by his death. Mr. Balfour's speech was undoubtedly among the very best delivered in either House of Parliament on that momentous occasion, and those who listened to it, or who read it afterwards, and who remember that it came from a man representing a party which had been during all the active years of Gladstone's life steadily opposed to almost every great reform that he endeavoured to accomplish, felt the more deeply the force and full meaning of the tribute just given forth to the memory of modern England's greatest statesman.

Sir William Harcourt, as leader of the Opposition, seconded the motion. He dwelt in some effective sentences on the fact that the opening years of the century had beheld the eclipse of two of the greatest Parliamentary lights of an earlier day, the younger Pitt and Charles James Fox, and

that the closing years of the same century saw the passing away of the greatest figure that had ever adorned the House of Commons. He reminded the House that during Mr. Gladstone's whole career he had declined all personal distinction; that it was therefore all the more the duty of the nation to bestow upon him the highest mark of honour it had yet at its disposal. What Gladstone believed he intensely believed; what he wished he greatly wished; what he wrought he strenuously wrought. Sir William paid a high tribute to Mr. Gladstone's style as a debater, and to the 'rich harmony of his melodious voice, which had the charm of an almost physical persuasion,' and he asked, 'Who could forget the dignified presence, the lucid statement, the resources of reasoning, the high tone of passionate conviction, the vehement appeal to conscience and truth?' Touching on one of Mr. Gladstone's qualities as a debater, which has not been always so well remembered as his oratorical fluency and impassioned emotion, Sir William Harcourt reminded the House that Mr. Gladstone was also master of the lightest moods, and that, when the occasion suited, his satirical humour 'played like summer lightning around his theme.' He also dwelt upon the stately dignity and the old-world courtesy which Mr. Gladstone ever extended to friend and foe alike. The ruling passions of his nature were for freedom and peace, and his voice went forth to all who were desolate and oppressed wherever they might abide. We may mention here

that during a debate in the House, many years before, an Irish member had applied to Mr. Gladstone the words with which the Irish national poet, Thomas Moore, has described Charles James Fox, 'Thou on whose burning tongue truth, peace, and freedom hung,' and that Mr. Gladstone himself had frankly expressed the gratification he felt on hearing such a comparison and such a tribute of praise. Sir William Harcourt's speech had in it a thrill of personal emotion which enhanced the impression it made upon the listening House.

On the part of the Irish members Mr. John Dillon claimed for himself and his colleagues an especial right to join in this tribute to the great Englishman, if only because the last and most glorious years of his strenuous and splendid life were dominated by the love he bore to the Irish nation, and by his eager and even passionate desire to give to Ireland liberty and peace. Mr. Dillon declared that while Mr. Gladstone was the greatest Englishman of his time, and while he loved his own people as much as any Englishman could do, he did not hesitate even in the case of his much-loved England to say that she was wrong when he believed she was doing wrong to others, and thus fearlessly faced an unpopularity among his own countrymen which must have been bitter for such a man to bear. Thus, said Mr. Dillon, 'he became more even than a British statesman and took his place among the great leaders of the human race.' On

the part of the Welsh people Mr. Alfred Thomas, a Welsh member, bore his tribute and the affectionate tribute of the Welsh people to the great statesman whose mortal remains were soon to be laid in Westminster Abbey. The motion thus proposed, seconded, and supported, was of course unanimously agreed to by the House of Commons.

The natural wish of Gladstone's own family that he should be laid to rest near to his own home at Hawarden was well known to many who were present during that sitting of the House and to many in the world outside. The family, however, promptly decided that the will of the Sovereign and the nation should be carried out, and they therefore consented to accept a public funeral and the interment of the statesman's remains in Westminster Abbey. There were certain conditions to the acceptance of such a ceremonial which Gladstone had expressed in his will, and these conditions in themselves were but a new and striking testimony to the nature of the man. The conditions were that wherever his body was to lie a place must be kept for the remains of the wife whom he had loved and by whom he had been loved so dearly and so tenderly, and that when her life should have passed away she was to be laid beside him in the grave. It was also expressed as his wish that the funeral rites should be made as simple as possible, and that no laudatory inscription should be written upon his tomb. The funeral ceremonial was

carried out in distinct accordance with Gladstone's own wishes. The body of the dead man was allowed to remain in his study at Hawarden. The room was visited with mournful reverence by the neighbours of all ranks and classes, and then the body, in a simple oak coffin with brass handles, was removed to London by night and carried privately to Westminster. A bier was constructed for the time in the centre of Westminster Hall, that great scene of so many immemorial political events, and there he lay for two days in state. During those two days an unceasing army of mourners passed through the Hall to pay their silent tribute of reverence to the illustrious man whose resting there even for that short time lent new historic glory to the annals and the memories of the place.

The day fixed for the funeral was the 28th of May, and on that day both Houses of Parliament met at ten o'clock in the morning. The Commons, led by the Speaker and the Serjeant-at-Arms, passed through Westminster Hall and through New Palace Yard, and thus entered Westminster Abbey. The Peers, led by the Lord Chancellor, and followed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, then came into the Hall, and passed in procession to their places in Westminster Abbey. Mrs. Gladstone and her family, the Princess of Wales and the Duchess of York, and the representatives of many foreign Sovereigns and States, were already present. Mr. Gladstone's coffin was then set upon

a plain open car, and at the sides of the car moved the pall-bearers. Among the pall-bearers were the Duke of Rutland, who, as Lord John Manners, had been Mr. Gladstone's colleague in the representation of Newark, the first constituency which had sent him into the House of Commons; Lord Rosebery, as Mr. Gladstone's successor in the position of Prime Minister; Lord Salisbury and Lord Kimberley, as leaders of the House of Lords; Mr. Arthur James Balfour and Sir William Harcourt, as representing the House of Commons. The Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, deputed to represent the Sovereign on that historic occasion, had places also among the pall-bearers. The coffin was met at the door of the Abbey by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Dean of Westminster. The ceremonial of lowering the coffin into the grave was accompanied by a service all the more impressive because it was made purposely simple and plain, and some of Mr. Gladstone's favourite hymns were part of the service.

The grave of Gladstone is near to that of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Beaconsfield. Some of those who were present must have been reminded of the poet's lines which tell us that if you 'drop upon Fox's grave a tear 'twill trickle to his rival's bier.' The long rivalry between Gladstone and Disraeli had not left any painful memories behind it for the admirers of either man. Those indeed whose political faith made

them followers of Gladstone might have remembered with satisfaction that some of Disraeli's most memorable successes in legislation were but the carrying out of the policy originated by Gladstone and opposed and for the time even overthrown by his most powerful political opponent. The position of Mr. Gladstone's grave near to that of Sir Robert Peel was in every sense appropriate. Peel was Gladstone's early leader and model. Each man in some of his qualities as statesman and orator may be admitted to have surpassed the other, but there can hardly be any question as to the fact that Gladstone had a much wider and more varied range of thought and action than belonged to Peel, and that his sympathies drew him into many spheres of literature and art, and even of political reform, into which the more limited and methodical temperament of Peel never carried him. Gladstone's speeches contained many passages of glowing and almost poetic eloquence which are not to be found even in Peel's most successful displays of Parliamentary oratory, and Gladstone individually exercised a fascinating and commanding power over men which was never possessed by the other great English leader. Yet it must be recognised that Gladstone was to a great extent the follower and the successor of Peel, and it would seem as if the biography of the one man would be incomplete as a historical lesson without the biography of the other. Nothing can be more evident than the fittingness of that

last event which set the grave of Gladstone close beside the grave of Peel. Perhaps we may here anticipate history and record the fact that Mrs. Gladstone was buried in Westminster Abbey on the 19th of June 1900. She had not to endure a very long period of widowhood before her closing illness set in, and she was laid by the side of that husband to whom she had been for so many years the most devoted and unfailing wife, companion, and friend. Happy in their lives, in their deaths they were not long divided.

Gladstone has been more fortunate than most great men in his biographer. In that biographical good fortune he somewhat resembled Socrates, for it is not too much to say that the story of his life has been told to the world by one who knew him as well, and studied him as closely, as either of his famous biographers had studied Socrates. John Morley's 'Life of Gladstone' will be valuable to all time as the record of the great statesman's career by one who had known him intimately and had worked with him in some of the noblest movements which it was his choice and his fortune to lead. For those who desire to study the life and career of Gladstone in order to come to a thorough understanding of his personal character, of the work he accomplished and endeavoured to accomplish, of the manner in which he approached and studied every subject brought within the sphere of his interest, and of the feelings and purposes which

inspired him in every act of his public life, John Morley's work must have an imperishable historical value. We have in its chapters a complete narrative, many passages of it told in Gladstone's own words, of the manner in which each successive event impressed itself upon his mind; of the gradual changes brought about in his opinions by the study of each subject; the slow-growing conviction in this instance, the sudden flash of inspiring light in that other. We see how his many-sided nature came to realise the demands of each new claim made upon his attention, and to seek the best way of bringing each cause to full success when once it had secured his adhesion. It reads very often as if Gladstone himself were telling his story to a listening friend whom he believed well qualified to tell that same story later on for the benefit of a listening world. There have been many lives of Gladstone written by admiring and appreciative authors, but Mr. Morley's work must ever be regarded as the authentic and authoritative record of that life of unsurpassed activity and on the whole of superb success.

The retirement of Mr. Gladstone from public life, followed so soon by his death, left the Liberal party in a somewhat peculiar position. We are not now dwelling merely on the fact that there was no man in that party who could claim to be Gladstone's rightful successor, or who had given ample evidence of his title to hold such a position. It must happen from time to time to every great

political party to lose a leader of supreme ability whose loss it may appear just then hardly possible to repair. This was not the peculiarity in the position of the Liberal party which especially calls for notice here. There were in that party some men of great and rising ability who might well be expected to become in time capable and successful leaders even if they were not possessed of those surpassing qualities of eloquence and of political genius with which Gladstone was endowed. John Morley and James Bryce had already won for themselves high literary distinction, and each of them had also proved that he could achieve success in Parliamentary debate. There seemed no reason to assume that either of these men might not in the daily training of his Parliamentary life become quite capable of leading a great party in the House of Commons. Sir William Harcourt, who was then leader of Opposition, was one of the most ready, eloquent, and powerful debaters in that assembly, and had proved himself, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, a master of finance capable of originating and carrying through great schemes of fiscal reform. Sir William Harcourt was in every sense a man well suited to lead the Liberal party under any conditions. It was, however, known to many of his colleagues, and was beginning to be known by the general public, that Sir William Harcourt did not feel himself physically equal to the unceasing and exhausting strain of political leadership, and that he was anxious to be

relieved at some early opportunity of that daily and nightly task.

But this again was not the peculiarity in the situation which rendered the work of the Liberal party so difficult at such a crisis. The Liberal party was in fact somewhat divided in itself, and the division seemed to be growing daily wider and more evident. There were two subjects in especial concerning which this difference of opinion or of feeling had lately been growing up. One of these was the question of Home Rule, and the other had to do with the rule of the Ottoman Turk and his dealings with his subject populations. Lord Rosebery had resigned the leadership of the Liberal party because he could not see his way to adopt the policy of Mr. Gladstone on the subject of Turkish misrule in Armenia, and because he could not associate himself in any political movement which might lead England into a European war. There were, even among the Liberal party, some who had a lingering objection to any course of definite hostility on the part of England towards the Ottoman power, partly perhaps for the reason that their minds were still occupied by the belief that the Turkish Empire was a sort of bulwark against the spread of Russian influence. Then there was the question of Home Rule for Ireland, and although Lord Rosebery had been a party to the carrying on of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, yet, as has been already shown in this History, he accepted the principle of Home Rule

only in a very qualified sense, and in later days it was understood that he had withdrawn from it altogether. On that subject also there were not a few among English Liberals who shared Lord Rosebery's doubts and fears, and had allowed their minds to be filled with a curious idea that to give to Ireland a Parliament of her own such as Canada and Australia already possessed would be simply to begin the dismemberment of the British Empire. Some influential Liberals had actually and formally withdrawn from the ranks of the Liberal party because they could not constrain themselves any longer to tolerate the Home Rule scheme, and the Administration of Lord Salisbury now held more than one convert from the doctrines of the statesman whose body had recently been entombed in Westminster Abbey.

There can be no question that among a certain section of Liberals the idea had fast taken hold that the policy of Home Rule for Ireland lay buried in that statesman's grave. The reflective and impartial reader may find it hard to understand how this idea came into existence, seeing that Mr. Gladstone's measure of reform for Ireland had passed through just the same stages of progress which had to be accomplished by almost every great measure of reform for England. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill was rejected by the House of Commons. His second Home Rule Bill passed safely through the House of Commons and was rejected only when it

came for the first time into the House of Lords. Gladstone, in the last speech which he ever delivered to the House of Commons, had dwelt upon this important fact, and had impressed upon the House that the hereditary chamber had done with the Home Rule Bill just what it had done at first with every important measure brought forward in the cause of political advancement. If Gladstone had been but a few years younger, or could have retained his health and strength for a few years more, he would in all human probability have compelled the House of Lords to accept his measure as that House had been compelled by Gladstone himself, and other great statesmen, to adopt other measures of enlightened legislation. Still it is quite certain that a section of the Liberal party did about this time fully believe that Home Rule had no longer the support of public opinion in the country, and had found accordingly that their own political principles were, on this subject at least, in accordance with the principles of the Conservative party. There were therefore many among the ranks of those who still called themselves Liberals who were in full sympathy with the Conservatives on some questions of home and foreign policy.

This state of things rendered the position of any new Liberal leader extremely difficult for the time. No matter how great might be his own capacity for Parliamentary leadership, he was unavoidably embarrassed every now and then in his political movements by the knowledge that he

could not count on the support of all his party, and he never could feel sure as to what proportion of support he could command if any great question should happen to arise for prompt decision. Perhaps the scientific or at all events the historical explanation of this new state of things might be found in the theory that the Liberal party had for the time spent its force, and that a period of reaction had come on. We shall find this occurring again and again in the history of political parties. Success after success follows great and united movements, and then for no apparently sufficing reason the strain of effort seems to have exhausted itself and a sort of paralysing influence creeps over the energies of many among the reformers. Such a crisis had now to all appearance come to the Liberal party, and it would have been hardly possible for any Liberal leader, however eloquent and energetic, to galvanise his followers soon again into the conditions which favour further progress. It may be taken for granted that this temporary collapse of energy will last but for a limited season, and that the interval of collapse will be followed sooner or later by a restoration of healthful energy. But for the time the season of reaction and depression was on, and the sincere, unchanging, and highly-qualified statesmen who yet remained on the Opposition side of the House of Commons must have felt their grief at the death of their former leader made more intense by the knowledge that with him had gone out for a time

at least the inspiration which made the creed of Liberalism a living and conquering influence at so many a memorable crisis in history.

This chapter is the most appropriate place in which to tell of the change that befell the leadership of the Liberal Opposition not very long after the death of Gladstone. During the intervening time Sir William Harcourt had discharged effectively and brilliantly all the duties that belonged under the conditions to the work of a Liberal leader. He had gallantly and persistently opposed many a measure and a projected policy put forward by the Conservative Government. The manner in which he maintained his place as Liberal leader received the full recognition of the whole House of Commons, where the work and eloquence of a capable man are not criticised merely with regard to the political creed he advocates. But the divisions existing in the Liberal party itself rendered it almost impossible for the leader of that party to maintain anything more than a defensive attitude. For the time there was a want of cohesive energy among the Liberals which no eloquence and no tact on the part of a leader could supply. The general impression on the public mind was that some change might be anticipated, and no great surprise was felt when the London newspapers of December 14, 1898, published a correspondence between Sir William Harcourt and Mr. John Morley concerning the leadership of the Liberal Opposition.

Sir William Harcourt's letter was written from his home at Malwood, December 8, and in it the Liberal leader informed his friend and colleague that he had been told some discussion was likely to be raised with regard to the future leadership of the Liberal Opposition. Sir William then went on to say that such a question was not one of great personal interest to him, as he had already a fixed resolution to undertake no responsibility and to occupy no position the duties of which it was made impossible for him to fulfil. It would have been his desire, he explained, to seek relief from the burden and the responsibility of an official position at the time when Mr. Gladstone retired from public life, but he then thought it his duty to remain at his post as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to carry out what he believed to be a just and adequate financial policy. Sir William reminded his friends that some good work had been done by the Liberal party, even in later days, when they stood firmly together and were united in their action, but he asserted that no man could consent to lead with any hope of credit to himself or advantage to the country, 'a party rent by personal disputes and sectional interests.' The last passages of the letter told Mr. Morley that should he arrive at the conclusion that he could best discharge his duty in an independent position in the House of Commons, 'you will, I feel sure, agree that a disputed leadership beset by distracted sections and conflicting interests is an impossible

situation, and a relief from vain and onerous obligations will come to me as a welcome relief.'

Mr. Morley's reply was sympathetic. He said that no Opposition leader had ever faced a more discouraging or difficult task than that of leading the Liberal party in the House of Commons after the great defeat in 1895. 'There is to my mind,' Mr. Morley wrote, 'something odious—I can find no other word—in telling a man who has strenuously faced all this, who has stuck manfully to the ship instead of keeping snug in harbour because the seas were rough and skies dark, that his position in his party is to be incessantly made matter for formal contest and personal challenge.' 'You and I have not always agreed in every point of tactics or of policy since you have been the working leader of the Liberal party—but I am confident that every colleague we have who has shared our party counsels since the disaster of 1895 will join me in recognising the patience, the persistency, and the skill with which you have laboured to reconcile such differences of opinion as arose, and to promote unity of action among us.' The letter concluded with the words, 'We are now to dismiss all this from our minds for no other reason that I know of than that you have not been able to work political miracles and to achieve party impossibilities. On the contrary, I, for one, feel bound to say how entirely I sympathise with the feelings that have drawn this letter from you.'

The publication of these letters created a pro-

found sensation not only throughout the whole of the Liberal party, but throughout the whole of the country. Even though Sir William Harcourt's announcement of his intention to resign the leadership had not been altogether unexpected, yet when it did come it created a deep sensation, and was everywhere discussed. The general feeling among all parties was that Sir William Harcourt had, at an extremely trying crisis, and during a protracted season of political controversy, proved well his capacity to lead, and had marked himself out as a man who might fairly aspire at no distant day to hold the position of Prime Minister in a Liberal Government. The sudden break in such a career could not but make a profound sensation everywhere. There were many hopes that Sir William might be induced to reconsider his resolve, and to continue his work as Liberal leader. But there were speeches made at political meetings after the publication of the letters, by men still proclaiming themselves Liberals, which, while giving forth much praise of Harcourt's character, capacity, and leadership, still seemed to make certain reserves and to indicate certain differences of opinion not calculated to encourage the hopes of a full reconciliation. The result was made manifest in the early spring of the year following, when Sir William Harcourt's resignation was shown to be an accomplished fact, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was chosen as the leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons. The choice was made at the

meeting of the Liberal party held in the Reform Club, at which it was declared that Sir William Harcourt's resignation was absolute and final. All or most of those present must have known well that it would have been all but impossible to prevail upon Lord Rosebery and Sir William to work together if the existing conditions were to be prolonged. The resignation of Sir William Harcourt was, as we have shown, the direct result of the differences of opinion which had arisen among the Liberals themselves, mainly on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. As it was said at the time, John Morley and Harcourt had nailed their colours to the mast in the maintenance of Gladstone's policy, while other men of influence were more or less avowedly for the hauling down of the flag. The common idea among those whom we may call the seceders, although they did not openly secede, was that a new Liberal party might be created which should be, above all things else, what was now described as Imperialist, which should concern itself mainly about Imperial interests and should regard Home Rule as out of the question. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was certainly not one of those men, but his election to the leadership of the Opposition in the House of Commons was a step which, for the moment, did not proclaim as impossible the development of the new policy.

CHAPTER V.

‘ANOTHER DAYBREAK IN THE EAST.’

ANOTHER day was indeed beginning to break in the East, although not by any means according to the sense of that passage in Shakespeare which has been taken as the title of this chapter. Daybreak is not always, even in our atmosphere, the signal of coming light, hope, and tranquillity. The daybreak in the East which now began to show itself was but a portent of new troubles to the world. From long before the days of Alexander until long after the days of Napoleon Bonaparte the ambition to hold the gorgeous East in fee has been portentous of disturbance and trouble to Europe. Once again a fresh outbreak of such disturbance and trouble was making its coming manifest. A new claimant for influence and sovereignty in the Eastern world was appearing, and new rivals from the West were showing their resolve to contend for Eastern territory. Japan had suddenly shaken off the traditions and the ways of ages and faced the world with a lately-acquired mastery of all the

old world's mechanisms and methods in the arts of war as well as of peace. For long years after Queen Victoria came to the throne Japan remained as she had been from her historic dawn, a rigidly isolated nation, refusing with resolution and tenacity to have any intercourse or association with the world of the West. As she seemed to the Portuguese traders in the sixteenth century, as she seemed to William Adams, as she seemed to Commodore Perry when America wooed and won her reluctant hospitality, so she continued to seem to strangers till the thirtieth year of the Queen's reign. Till 1867 Japan was a feudal nation living for itself, and content with the manners, the customs, and the knowledge of the past. In 1867 and the succeeding year feudalism was overthrown in a civil war, and the victorious party, the party of progress, completely reversed the old policy of aloofness and grasped with both hands at all it could gather of European civilisation and European learning.

Russia had now become in a certain sense an Oriental Power, and had plainly no intention of remaining content with such territory as she had already acquired. It was also quite evident that Germany as a great military empire and also a great trading power did not intend to allow the East to be recast and remoulded without herself having some share in the arrangements and advantages of such a transformation. The question of frontier lines was becoming with every year a

subject of greater difficulty and of more animated dispute. The policy of England was in the minds of most of her statesmen merely to guard and hold what she already possessed; but the minds of others among her political leaders were filled with the creed of Imperialism—the creed that it is the duty and the mission of England to spread her Empire to an unlimited extent.

On the 18th of December 1897 it was announced to the world through leading newspapers that the Russian fleet was, with the consent of China, to winter at Port Arthur. The announcement was accompanied by an intimation that this act was not in any sense an act of hostility to European or Asiatic powers. This additional announcement, intended obviously to allay all alarm, had on many readers only the effect of arousing apprehension. In England at least the general public had up to the appearance of this news felt no alarms on the subject of Port Arthur, and indeed to a large proportion of that public the Port Arthur question was as yet an unknown quantity. Not long before the Russian squadron had sought for shelter in Port Arthur a German fleet had occupied Kiau-Chau as a coaling station, and this occupation, it was declared, had been approved of by the Chinese Government. The officer in command of the German fleet had issued a proclamation announcing that his sovereign, the German Emperor, had instructed him to land at Kiau-Chau Bay at the

head of his forces and occupy the bay and all its islands and dependencies. This occupation was to continue until the case of certain German missionaries murdered in Shantung had been settled. The proclamation went on to say that the inhabitants of the region occupied were free to continue peaceably in their several occupations, and were advised to pay no attention to any unauthorised words coming from disreputable personages, who were only striving to create disturbance. As a matter of fact, so said the proclamation, Germany and China had always been friendly and at peace, and the Germans were not now in those waters as enemies of China. Further explanations were given by the official organs of the Government in Germany itself. The organs announced that the Chinese Government had transferred all the rights of sovereignty it possessed in ceded territory to the Imperial German Government on a long lease. The peaceful protestations of Germany had not in themselves quite the effect of allaying the alarm now spreading abroad.

The attention of the world began to be drawn directly and keenly towards the peninsula of Corea in Eastern Asia, a region which had long been tributary to China and from which all foreigners were shut out until 1882. It was a region of almost perpetual disturbance, and there were frequent risings against the Sovereign of Corea and frequent interventions on the part of Japan in order to restore peace. The Japanese

were greatly interested in the promotion of peace and order in Corea. The general impression of the outer world was that the attentions of Japan were not merely moved by a beneficent design to establish tranquillity and good government there, but were much impelled by the wish to make Corea a tributary of Japan. China asserted once again her sovereign rights over Corea, and there were several European interventions and mediations, England, among other Powers, asserting in the interest of peace and for the sake of her commerce in the East her claim to have a station in the peninsula. The Coreans became impatient of Chinese sovereignty, entered into a sort of alliance with Japan, and the result was a treaty of alliance between Japan and Corea and a war with China. The Chinese got the worst of it, and Port Arthur, an important naval arsenal, was taken by the Japanese in 1894. Peace was made at last under conditions which still recognised the independence of Corea, but allowed the Japanese to retain the places which they had captured. Against this arrangement Russia, Germany, and France protested on the ground that the practical annexation of Corean territory by the Japanese was a danger to foreign commerce and to the interests of peace. Finally, a treaty was made between Russia and Japan providing for the maintenance of Corea's independence under the combined protection of these two Powers. This combined protection did not give much satisfac-

tion to the rest of the world. England and Japan afterwards came to an arrangement between themselves for the maintenance of Corea's independence with the concession of certain stations to each of these Powers, while still recognising Corea as an independent State.

The idea, however, of an independent State which had to give up certain parts of its territory to the occupation of foreign Powers did not seem to promise a long-enduring and satisfactory settlement of the questions involved, and it soon became apparent to all the world that Corea was destined to be the battle-ground of rival and foreign claims. When any especial concession was made to one of these foreign Powers the inevitable result was that each of the other States felt that its own claims were damaged by such a preference, and insisted on some immediate reparation. Then began the system of granting leases allowing for a limited term of years each of the more important foreign States to have a domain of its own in the disputed territory. England had a certain domain assigned to her, and Russia another, and Germany a third, and so on; and the world began to recognise the fact that the future government of Corea must depend altogether on the fortunes of war, in which the most persevering, the most exacting, and the strongest foreign State might be expected in the end to become master of the whole territory. Before long it was evident that the struggle for

supremacy must now be a trial of strength between Russia and Japan. The foreign policy of England had become too moderate of late years to allow her to put forth her strength in a war merely for the acquisition of foreign territory; France and Germany had interests nearer home to look after; China had by this time come to be practically out of the struggle, and whether she were allowed to exercise her nominal sovereignty was a matter of little or no interest to any of the European States. China, in fact, did not count just then, and the eyes of the world were turned, so far as Corea was concerned, on the rivalry between Japan and Russia.

The final attempts to bring the competing claims of these two Powers to a settlement led to a war with which this volume has not to deal. The subject has been introduced here only to give readers some idea of the conditions under which arose one of the most remarkable struggles between an Eastern State and a great European Power known to all history. Russia could hardly be described merely as one of the European Powers, for her vast Siberian territory with its growing civilisation and its lines of railway was rapidly developing for her a wide new field in the Far East, and was bringing her more and more every day into collision with a rising Asiatic State like that of Japan. The Japanese had been growing rapidly in all the arts recognised as characteristic of Western civilisation, and they

had been making it evident that their destiny as well as their desire was to become one of the great States of the modern world. Every step in their progress marked them out more decisively as Russia's rival in the East, and Russia's own practical interests, along with her desire for conquest in war, made her inevitably the enemy to the supremacy of Japan. The world was destined soon to see those rival claims submitted to the arbitrament of war. Even at the time which belongs to the events of this volume the foreseeing observer must have already made up his mind that the struggle for the ownership of Corea had been given over to the eager hands of Russia and Japan. China, whatever her future destinies may be, seemed at that time to have faded as an influence into the infinite azure of the past. Japan was suddenly springing up into a life of fresh and marvellous energy, quick with every new idea which modern science, art, commerce, and craft could give. Russia was becoming a great Asiatic as well as European Power, and was threatening the decaying empires of the old East with the aggressive Imperialism of the new. The lists were therefore fairly cleared for the encounter between Russia and Japan, but years had yet to pass before the newest of European and the newest of Asiatic great Powers were to come into actual conflict for supremacy of influence in the Far East.

The East, near or far, has for many generations

kept the mind of Europe, and especially the mind of England, almost constantly occupied in watching the forecasts of warlike disturbance. At this period there seemed no immediate prospect of any serious antagonism among the great Powers of Europe, but the relations of some at least of those great Powers with the movements of events in the East appeared to sound many a note of alarm. It was evident, as we have said, that China as an Imperial State was losing her place in the Eastern world, and that the great empire was about to undergo some process of dismemberment or dissolution. China had not up to this time played a part of much importance in the life of the Eastern hemisphere, but her negative influence in acting as a huge barrier between this or that rising Power had been highly useful, although without any such intention on the part of China herself, in maintaining the interests of peace. A general impression now prevailed in the West that the Chinese Empire was breaking up, was ceasing to be of any use for the preservation of peace, even as a barrier, and that her condition was likely to hold out irresistible temptation to newer and more rising Powers for the gratifying of ambition and the extension of empire.

Statesmen in Europe began to ask themselves what European Power would be likely to derive most benefit from the break-up of China, and which European Power would be the first to try its fortune in that way. So far as the Eastern

hemisphere was concerned nothing could be more clear than the evidences that the position and ambition of Japan were certain to make her prompt and keen in any such competition. Among the States of Europe it was manifest that England, with her great Indian Empire, must ever be deeply interested in every change which might affect the conditions of Asiatic States. France, for the time, was occupied more in Africa than in Asia; but Germany was extending largely her shipping enterprises, and was naturally anxious to secure landing-places on Chinese and Japanese coasts, while Russia was regarded as a Power from which at any moment fresh disturbance might be created in the Far East.

Russia, indeed, began once again to be a sort of hobgoblin to the civilised Powers of the Western world who had any interest, commercial or territorial, in the Far East. Among political men in England Russia became the synonym for threatened peril to England, and that important historical personage, the man in the street, was often in the humour to set down a failure of the crops anywhere to the plottings and perfidies of Russia. There were meantime the usual troubles to the English Government about the arrangements which they were perpetually called upon to make, unmake, and remake concerning the frontier lines of their Indian and other Eastern territory to secure the inhabitants of the British possessions against the incursions of native tribes. Much was

heard about the efforts of the Mad Mullah, as he was usually called in England, to disturb the British settlements and to compel some of the native rulers to join him in his enterprises. The Mad Mullah, whose madness appeared to have had now and then an amount of method in it, actually gave a native ruler his choice between joining him in his attempts on British territory or being himself invaded and conquered. The British Commander-in-Chief had to send troops to sustain the native ruler thus threatened, and some encounters more or less serious took place. The Mullah was completely routed for the time, but he made his escape and was to be heard of again before very long.

There was trouble of a most serious order in the Bombay region, where a new attack of plague, that ghastly and not unfamiliar visitant of Indian Provinces, began to make its appearance once again in the early part of 1898. It was shown by figures at the time that the total mortality from the malady was more than 100,000, some 28,000 deaths occurring in Bombay city and over 70,000 in the Presidency and Sind. The *Annual Register* for that year tells us that a commission of scientific experts was appointed to inquire into the origin of these outbreaks of plague, the manner in which the disease had been communicated, and the value of certain curative measures which had been recommended by medical science. The *Annual Register* says that 'from evidence it

appeared that the classes most affected were low-class Hindoos, and that Mahomedans were not so liable to infection.' It goes on to say that 'most of the cases were among the poor; and as the granaries were the first places infected in Bombay the plague was spread by means of rats which were subject to the disease.' A strict medical examination of all persons coming by road or rail into a district, and the complete disinfection of clothing, was ordered by the Bombay Government 'as preferable to detention camps for travellers and the irksome system of passes that had previously been enforced.'

But these needful measures, taken especially in the interests of the poorer classes among the natives, led in several instances to serious disturbances. We have had many experiences even in modern Europe of popular resistance offered to the carrying out of measures for the prevention of disease, and this temper was shown very strongly in some quarters of Bombay city. The authorised examiners in one case endeavoured to discover the nature and the cause of a plague-like malady affecting a Mahomedan woman, and the family and friends of the woman absolutely refused to allow any medical examination. The police were called in to enforce the Government order; the mob of the quarter attacked the police, and thus created a riot which the troops of the garrison had to be called out to repress. Many European officers, soldiers, and police were badly

injured before the riots could be entirely suppressed. So strong was the feeling among the natives in some parts of the city that Europeans passing quietly through the streets and having no connection whatever with carrying out the sanitary measures were attacked, beaten, or stabbed, many of them receiving dangerous injuries. The ambulances that were used for the removal of sufferers were set upon here and there, and the European nurses had to be guarded by the troops in order that their lives might be saved from further and more dangerous assaults. Attempts were made to set fire to the hospitals, and in one instance the house surgeon was severely wounded before effectual help could be obtained, and the mob had to be finally driven back by volleys of rifles from the troops who were summoned to defend the place.

In order to restore something like quiet to the neighbourhood, the authorities thought it needful to make official proclamation that the sanitary measures instituted were only intended for the relief of the actual sufferers from plague, and the prevention of its spreading abroad over the community; that no steps would be taken in any case for the detention and the inspection of corpses, or for any delay in the celebration of the funeral rites which the families of the dead felt it their duty to carry out according to their own religious forms. We can all remember what surprise and horror were created here in England when the news of

these riotous uprisings against the sanatory policy of the Government in Bombay was announced, but it has to be remembered that the duty imposed on those entrusted with carrying out those measures was extremely difficult and delicate. The poorer class in some native quarter of a city like Bombay were not likely to understand the principles of medical sanitation, and would be apt, perhaps not unnaturally, to fancy that such a course of action on the part of the authorities was made in disregard of the native faith, which directed certain religious formalities in the burial of the dead. We have seen even in England a strong moral resistance offered by educated persons to the carrying out of certain measures ordained by law to prevent the spread of contagion, and we need not feel much surprise that an ignorant native population in the poorest quarter of an Indian city should have broken into riot against the most reasonable and well-meant efforts of the authorities to protect against disease the families of the very men who were in arms against them.

After the riots had been suppressed, some trials took place, among which was that of five Mahomedans, charged with killing two British soldiers during the excitement caused by the plague and preventive measures. Of these Mahomedans, who were all convicted, one was sentenced to death, and the other four were punished by transportation for life. The plague and the riots had at least the good effect of urging the Bombay Legislative Council

and the other authorities to take some wide and general measures for the improvement of the conditions under which life had to be carried on by the poorer classes in and around Indian cities. These measures were for the most part of a very simple and elementary order, but they were, nevertheless, the only measures of a practical character that could then have been taken by the ruling powers. These new, quite new, sanatory enterprises consisted mainly in the opening up of overcrowded and pestilential quarters, the wholesale pulling down of crowded dens where human beings were massed together, the widening of thoroughfares, the actual demolition and rebuilding of many parts of the native quarters, the reclaiming of large seashore districts, and the general admission of purifying light and air to a stifling population.

It was not only in Bombay that rioting occurred because of the attempts made by the authorities to put into operation some measures for the prevention of the spread of disease. A disturbance, which at first seemed to be very formidable, took place in Calcutta when the authorities there found that it was imperative for them to rescue the community from the spread of contagion; but it was put down promptly by armed police, and the military force had not to be called out. A few months later the announcement was officially made that Calcutta was quite free from plague, and that the entire number of deaths in the city, since the outbreak of the disease, was less than two hundred. The

seriousness of the epidemic can be all the better understood from the fact that this number of deaths was considered on the whole to represent a satisfactory escape from the threatened danger. The preventive measures and the prompt action of the authorities appear to have fully vindicated themselves, and were made the subject of general congratulation.

At the close of the year 1898 an important change took place in the Government of India. The Administration of Lord Elgin as Viceroy came to an end, at the end of the five years' term, and he retired from office. Lord Elgin came of a family which had distinguished itself much in the rule of India, and in many other fields where celebrity was to be won. He had had many serious troubles to encounter during his Viceroyalty. There was a frontier war; there had been plague and famine, and he had shown ability and energy in dealing with all these troubles. There had been great extension of the Indian railway system during his tenure of office, and it appeared from a report on the subject, issued with the authority of the Government, that there had been a net increase of nearly eight hundred miles of line during the closing year of his Administration. Lord Elgin's successor in office was Lord Curzon of Kedleston. The appointment of a new Viceroy was a subject of much political speculation at home. The new Viceroy, who before his appointment was well known in England as George Nathaniel Curzon,

was born at Kedleston Hall, the seat of his family in Derbyshire. He had won many distinctions during his University career at Oxford, and in 1885 he became one of the private secretaries to the Marquis of Salisbury. At Oxford he had given much promise as a debater, and he soon developed a decided tendency for Parliamentary life. He was a strong Conservative in political principles. He contested South Derbyshire without success, but was able not long after to secure a seat for the Southport division of Lancashire. He won the election in a contest against a supporter of Mr. Gladstone. He had been a great traveller before entering political life; had shown a deep interest in Eastern countries and Eastern literature, and he continued his travels and studies after his election to the House of Commons. He was a writer of books which illustrated his wide Asiatic experience and observation, and were very popular among those sections of the British public who felt a genuine interest in the subjects he was especially anxious to make his own. He took part very often in the debates of the House of Commons, and as a speaker was always ready, fluent, and often really impressive.

When Lord Salisbury formed the Administration which lasted to the end of his life, Mr. Curzon was appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and this was not his first elevation to office, for under a former Conservative Government he had been for a time Under-Secretary for India. During the whole

of his Parliamentary career he had made himself very popular in the House, and was on the most friendly terms with many members who did not share any of his opinions on political questions, and were little inclined to favour that 'forward policy' in the rule of India which he strenuously advocated. He had always been a favourite in Society, and he married the daughter of a very rich American. By this alliance he was understood to have come in for much wealth, an understanding which would not be likely to decrease his popularity in any social circles. When the announcement was made of his elevation to the important position of Indian Viceroy it must be owned that much surprise was felt, not merely among his political opponents, but even among those who had sat with him on the Conservative benches. He was but thirty-nine years of age when he suddenly obtained his place as Viceroy, and the feeling of many inside and outside Parliament was that they had never thought of him as a likely man for so difficult and so responsible a position. Of course it has happened in many instances that a Prime Minister has obtained a thorough knowledge of the full capacity of some supporter whom the general public has hitherto failed to understand, and it often happens, too, that the choice of the Prime Minister has been fully justified by the result. Therefore, when any doubting comments were made as to the propriety of Lord Salisbury's selection, it could always be pointed out that Lord Salisbury probably knew a

great deal more about Mr. Curzon's capacity than even the keenest of outer observers was likely to know, and that Lord Salisbury was not given to making important appointments on the principle of a mere game of speculation. Still, it was certain that Lord Curzon, while in the House of Commons, had been thought of chiefly as a fluent debater and a great favourite in society, and his critics felt some surprise that such a position as that of Indian Viceroy should have been given to one whose career as a Member of Parliament had never made a deep impression on the House.

This volume cannot follow very far the history of Lord Curzon's career, and this would not be the place to express any definite views as to the results of his Indian Administration. It may be said that from the first he showed himself determined to carry out that forward policy which he had previously advocated in some of his writings, and it soon became clear that whatever future history might have to say about his Administration, it was not likely that future history could fail to have a good deal to say about it. It may be mentioned as a fact of some interest that Lord Curzon had of his own choice accepted an Irish and not an English peerage, and the general impression was that he had made this choice because he was unwilling to separate himself for ever from that House of Commons which he liked so well, and in which he had been so popular. According to our Constitutional arrangements, an Irish Peer may be

elected a member of the representative chamber by an English constituency, although he cannot represent there an Irish borough or county, and it may be taken for granted that the House of Commons is certain to hold among its members at any time one or two Irish Peers representing British constituencies. There was therefore a very general belief that Lord Curzon had reserved to himself a right to return to his old debating-ground if, when his tenure of office in India should come to an end, he felt unwilling either to accept a new viceroyalty or to settle himself down to a life of retirement.

There had not been for some time any very animated controversy in England about the Administration of India. Such a controversy was, however, certain to be revived before very long, and, in the opinion of many observers, Lord Curzon was well qualified to revive it. For that reason his appointment as Viceroy was looked upon with much satisfaction and still greater hope by one section of political observers, and with dread and apprehension by the other. The Imperialists felt confident that he was just the man to carry out the Imperialist policy in his rule of India. It is not easy to describe by any appropriate name the men opposed to the Imperialists. To describe them as anti-Imperialists would be entirely unfair, for it cannot be doubted that the great majority in all English political parties are unchangingly in favour of the maintenance of the Empire. On the other

hand, it would be unfair to the Imperialists if you were to describe their opponents merely as the peace party, because we must not assume that every Imperialist is naturally an enemy of peace, or that every Imperialist is a professional promoter of war. Still, the distinction between the two parties is clear enough. The Imperialists are possessed by the faith that the mission of England is to extend her power wherever she can, while the wholesome creed of the best of their opponents is that England's first duty is to provide for the peace and prosperity of the vast realms which she already owns, and to avoid all wars, unless such wars as are absolutely needed for the purposes of national defence. That which might be called, and was once called, the Peace Party—the party led in former days by men like Cobden and Bright—can hardly be said to have had any political existence as an organised influence during the later years of Queen Victoria's reign. There were still some eminent men in both Houses of Parliament who proclaimed their objection to all war which was not strictly defensive, and especially to war for territorial aggrandisement. But such declarations of faith were not often heard in Parliamentary debate, and there was nothing like an organised party, however small, to maintain that faith within the walls of Parliament. The Imperialists had it all very much their own way for the time, and the alarms and disturbances breaking out here and there in the East only seemed to give a new impulse and a

plausible support to their appeals for the spread of English dominion as a means of resistance to the efforts of new rivals for supremacy in the East.

Then set in the period when what were commonly described as 'spheres of influence' and 'spheres of interest' began to be adopted by Western statecraft as the rightful claim which civilised Powers might press upon Asiatic Governments and populations. There were some plausible advantages about this way of putting the question. The civilised Powers were nearly all of them great trading Powers, and it was held to be clearly for the good of the whole world that legitimate and healthful trade and commerce might have the door kept open for them in every Asiatic State. The landing of trading ships is not warlike invasion: commerce is not conquest. Why should not England be guaranteed secure landing-places on the shores of such countries as China, for instance—landing-places which were to be hers merely in the trading sense, and could give her no claims to any territorial jurisdiction outside the limits of the port itself? Thus would be offered the open door for the introduction of all manner of foreign products, and thus might be established the co-partnership of the world in general in the benefits enjoyed by each civilised nation. Such an open door was the privilege which Russia claimed when she sought for a lease of certain ports and sea-coast places belonging to the Chinese Empire; such was the

privilege sought also by Germany and by Japan, and then by England herself.

Nothing could have seemed more fair and satisfactory on the mere statement of the case than this arrangement, but when the principle came to be worked out in fact and in detail, the results did not prove so harmonious and so promising as might have been expected. The States which were privileged to enjoy these spheres of influence and these spheres of interest, and to keep the door open for the introduction of their home-grown commodities, began to be jealous of each other; each was understood to imply that all the others were making too extensive use, and even unfair use, of the privileges accorded. Moreover, there grew up among the privileged States a feeling of suspicion that the termination of the lease was not likely to be reached by some of the States within any time that human foresight could anticipate. It is all very well, the outer world said, to give Russia a definite term of lease on some Chinese shore, and to give Japan another term, and England and Germany other terms also; but who is to assure us that these States will be found willing to give up the tenure when the lease is out, or that China would be able to enforce her claim for the resumption of ownership if she should feel inclined to do so? This was a question that each of the privileged States was always disposed to ask with regard to its companions or rivals in the lease-holding privilege. There seemed to

be ample opportunities in such a state of things for coming complications, and even for serious troubles.

The reasons for this doubt and dread became more and more justified as events went on. It was evident that China, in her decaying and dissolving condition, was showing herself ready to make any temporary concessions demanded of her by any European Power having strength enough to make her demands formidable. In the early days of 1898 Europe learned that China had given a lease to Germany of a port in the district of Shantung, with a considerable extent of territory adjoining, for a period of ninety-nine years. Not long after it was announced that Prince Henry, brother of the German Emperor, had arrived at the port in command of a battleship in order to take formal possession of the conceded territory, and that he had been received by the Chinese Emperor at Peking with a great display of ceremonial welcome. At this time China much wanted some help in money to make the concluding payment of the Japanese war debt, and the British Government was inclined to help her through this difficulty if a proper consideration were given as a recompense. Lord Salisbury proposed that if the British Government were to undertake the negotiations for a loan of £16,000,000 to embarrassed China, the Chinese Emperor should give England a treaty port as a condition for the guarantee of the loan. But it was found that Russia was doing all she could to

interfere with this arrangement, and the result was that England's proposal came, for the time, to nothing. Then set in fresh negotiations, and at last the required loan was obtained through a combination of English and German syndicates, in which Japan also took a part and made a certain contribution to the loan. Russia had not proved ineffective in her action, for it was soon announced that the Chinese garrison had been withdrawn from Port Arthur and another port; that the Russian flag was displayed at both those stations; that 2000 Russian troops had been landed at Port Arthur; and that there were nine Russian warships guarding the conceded ports. China had conceded all the demands of Russia, and Port Arthur was to be fortified as a Russian naval station. The British Government could not submit to all this; and in order that England might have something to show for her agreement to these concessions, the Chinese authorities gave to her a lease for ninety-nine years of the port of Wei-hai-Wei, and here the British flag was soon displayed by the English naval commander and his seamen. A good deal was heard of Wei-hai-Wei during the events which followed, and some of the English newspapers treated the lease of that port with ridicule and contempt.

England also obtained the right to extend her Eastern railway system through certain parts of the territory now under discussion. England thus obtained a sphere of interest or a sphere of

influence in certain parts of China. The whole arrangements were, as might be expected, made the subject of enthusiastic approval by the supporters of the Administration of Lord Salisbury and very strong distrust and disapproval by the supporters of the Opposition. We need not follow in detail the history of these various arrangements. That they were not likely to be permanent must have been manifest even at the time to impartial and unconcerned observers in all countries having a share in them. The English Government professed to be desirous of maintaining the integrity of the Chinese Empire, and the Japanese authorities professed the same desire. It was now apparent to the whole world that Japan had embarked upon a policy which did not seem quite consistent with the maintenance of the Chinese Empire as it was then recognised. Russia also disclaimed all intention of carrying out any scheme of permanent annexation so far as China was concerned, but these assurances were generally received in all parts of the world with more or less polite incredulity. The meaning of these movements plainly was that China had come to be regarded everywhere as an Empire far too vast for her own power of maintenance, and that several European States as well as Japan were anxious to secure for themselves some spheres of interest and of influence before the break-up of China should throw all into confusion. We have now got beyond the period when such Powers could openly and boldly have

agreed among themselves to divide, by warlike conquest if necessary, so much of Chinese territory as should give to each of them a secure place of occupation on Chinese soil. The result, if it were to be brought about at all, had to be accomplished by mutual compromises and concessions. The foremost managers of this great new dramatic performance were, of course, Russia and Japan.

During the Easter recess in 1898 some speeches were made by leading Liberals on the whole subject. Mr. Leonard Courtney came to the front again at this critical period. He delivered a strong protest against the recent action of the Government in the Far East. But he did not come forward as an advocate of peace at any price, and the main purport of his protest was to make known his conviction that if the Government had acted with prompter and stronger resolve there might have been no danger either of immediate war or of feeble and temporary compromises which could only lead to war in the end. He spoke especially and avowedly as a free-trader. He contended that if the Government had acted wisely there might have been an international compact made in favour of free trade, the open port and the open door throughout the East, and that if Ministers had been firm there would have been no danger of a war with Russia. It will be seen that in setting forth these views Mr. Courtney was occupying his long familiar and quite congenial position as an independent member. Mr. Courtney's previous career has already been

described in this History, and it is not too much to say of him, that even while he held office in an Administration he had never been the mere partizan of any political system. During recent years he had been an independent member, having separated himself from his own party because he could not agree with their policy in relation to the suffrage and to Home Rule for Ireland, while there were many questions concerning which he could not possibly come into agreement with the existing Conservative Administration. His speech dealt with many other subjects of importance, but its interest for us just here is to be found in those passages which contain his criticism of the English Government's policy in the Far East. If Mr. Courtney had now had an opportunity of lending any support to the policy of the Government in Chinese affairs, he could hardly have been unwilling to give full expression to his approval. His speech was, however, a distinct condemnation of that part of the Government policy.

A close study of the events passing at the time may induce readers of the present day to agree with Mr. Courtney that if the Government had taken a firmer and more frankly declared position, there might have been a settlement of the whole question without any serious danger of an appeal to arms. It was becoming clearer with each succeeding year that it would no longer be possible to exclude the world's active civilising influences from a free entrance

into the great domain of China. The main question to be settled was as to the means by which some fair, reasonable, and thorough understanding could be come to among the civilised and civilising States for the establishment and the recognition of their spheres of interest or spheres of influence in those regions so as to avoid the encroachments of one privileged State upon the others, and the consequent dangers of rivalry and of war. Mr. Courtney again recommended the formation of an international compact in favour of free trade and the open door, and he expressed his belief that in such a policy would be found the real clue to the settlement of a vast and difficult problem. Many things have happened in England since that speech was made, and the question of free trade appears to have once again become a subject of keen and bitter dispute among Englishmen at home. Still, it can hardly be supposed that Mr. Chamberlain's new crusade for a return to the system of protection is likely to take any hold on the general English public, and it may be assumed that Mr. Courtney's suggestion did really contain the germ for a possible agreement among civilised Powers which might allow the principles of economic science to be introduced gradually and steadily, without the false arbitrament of war, into the vast realms of the Far East.

Another interesting speech made about the same time as Mr. Courtney's was delivered by Sir Edward Grey. This speech, too, is worthy of

especial interest, as it was made by a man who had never allowed himself to become, even when in office, the mere mouthpiece of an official and party policy. Sir Edward Grey was then, and is now, one of the rising men in the House of Commons. He entered Parliament as a Liberal, and during the Administration of Lord Rosebery he was Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In his speech during the Easter recess of 1898 he condemned the policy of the Conservative Government in Chinese affairs as dilatory, irresolute, and inconsistent. Nearly three years, he said, had passed away since it first became known that Russia was arranging for her occupation of Port Arthur, and only three weeks had gone since the English Government first began to discuss the question with the Government of Russia, and just at that critical moment the British ships were withdrawn from Port Arthur. He was moderate enough in his censure not to assume that the withdrawal of the British ships from Port Arthur was intended to signify that England meant to raise no objection to the carrying out of the arrangements then going on between the Russian Government and the rulers of China, but he insisted that the British Government ought to have made up their minds long before as to whether they did or did not intend to oppose the establishment of a Russian fortified naval station at that place. He contended that if the English Government were opposed to the plan they ought to have

given timely and distinct notice of their opposition, and that if this had been done, if an intelligent policy had been followed, Russia would never have pressed the demand for a concession so certain to bring about international trouble. He thought it was too soon just then to express a decided opinion as to whether the arrangement for the lease of Wei-hai-Wei was wise or not, and with regard to the other concessions of China to England, he put it somewhat epigrammatically that we had only secured one right, and that was the right always open to us of getting into a quarrel with any Power which interfered with those concessions. It would seem that Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Courtney were generally agreed upon the point that the English Government had failed to make up their minds in good time as to what course ought to be pursued by England in regard to this new principle of leasing out Chinese territory to foreign Powers, that the Government ought to have framed some policy on the subject, and made that policy known in such terms as to render it clear what England's action must be with regard to the novel principle of limited ownerships on Chinese territory.

It has been thought well to call attention to these two speeches as they both, although from different points of view, condemned the dilatory and undefined policy of the English Government, and both alike represented the opinions of men not content to be the mere exponents of party.

policy. There was a time when the Liberal party was much stronger, when it was greatly swayed by the influence of such men as Cobden and Bright, a time when Liberals in general would have stood up for the doctrine that England ought, if possible, to keep out of all foreign complications, especially from complications with Eastern Powers, and that no temporary arrangements between Russia and China, not directly involving the safety of the British Empire, ought to be regarded as calling for any warning or active interference. But that time had passed away, and there had been unquestionably a reaction against the policy of non-intervention which at one period was growing to have a strong hold on the minds of Englishmen. Even in the days of Cobden and Bright it may be assumed that the Liberal party would have recognised the necessity for any English Administration to come to some definite opinion, and to make that definite opinion known at the earliest suitable moment. The immediate effect of the dilatory course pursued by the English Government was to leave Russia, China, Japan, and Germany alike ignorant of the policy which the English Government intended to pursue in the event of certain concessions being made by China to Russia, Germany, and Japan. If England intended to interfere with this or that possible arrangement, why not say so? If she were determined to regard the whole business as no affair of hers, why not make known her resolve? Perhaps the best or only

excuse to be made for the English statesmen in office during the earlier part of the negotiations is that they really did not know what course it would suit them to pursue, that they had not taken the matter into consideration, and had therefore no announcement to make.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FAR EAST.

THE attention of the world, which had been for some time much occupied by the arrangements going on between China and such foreign States as England, Russia, Germany, and Japan, came now to be absorbed by events which disturbed the Government of China itself. The Dowager-Empress of China appears to have been a woman of decided ability and much ambition, with a complete reliance on herself and an ample estimate of her qualities for personal rule. She might be regarded as a sort of Chinese reproduction of England's Queen Elizabeth or of Russia's Catherine; and for a while it seemed as if she were destined to play an important part in the history of her vast country. When her son succeeded to the throne, the Dowager acted for some time as a sort of regent during what we should call his long minority. An Empress had made herself powerful more than once during former days in China, and this Empress seems to have had ambition and self-confidence enough to stimulate her towards an effort to seize

the first prominent opportunity for becoming really the sovereign power over the State. The Government of the country had always been conducted by what might be called a system of provincial councils, but the throne did its best to exercise in the end a supreme jurisdiction, and the Empress was not willing to lose her hold of any supremacy which might belong to her through her son.

A strong party was arising throughout China with the object of preventing that immigration of foreigners, and more especially of Europeans, which had been going on of late years. This agitation formed itself almost suddenly into an organised political movement, spreading broadly over all parts of the dominions. As was to be expected, the many recent dealings with great foreign Powers, the concessions made by the leasing of Chinese territory to Russia, England, Germany, and Japan, and the right given to these States and to the American Republic to make railways through China, aroused into feverish agitation the characteristic and ancestral hatred of the Chinese in general to the policy of the open door. A society or organisation known by the name of 'the Boxers' had set itself against all that modern policy which was displayed in the encouragement of foreigners to settle and hold land and property in China. The Dowager-Empress appeared for the time to be thoroughly opposed to that policy and to those who were encouraging the Emperor to its adoption. A strong force of public

opinion therefore supported the Empress when she took into her own hands the work of internal government. The state of affairs became worse and worse with every day. The Boxers began to show their hatred of foreigners by murderous outrages on strangers, and on natives who were supposed to favour the policy which was trying to break up what the Boxers believed to be the religious sacredness of China's ancient principle of absolute reservation from the outer world. It so happened that at the time there were many internal troubles in the land. There was a widespread failure in the growth of crops, and in many parts of the country there was absolute famine. The Boxers declared that all these evils had come from the immigration of strangers sanctioned by the ruling powers. It was even asserted that the foreigners had taken to the poisoning of wells here, there, and everywhere in China, and these statements were readily believed by vast numbers of the Chinese population. Great riots were set on foot in the capital city and in many parts of the Empire, and there were actual massacres of missionaries and their families, and more especially of native Chinese who had accepted, or were supposed to have accepted, the doctrines of Christianity.

It ought to be mentioned here that the name of the Boxers, which became so familiar at the time to the press and the public of all English-speaking countries, was a colloquial British rendering of the title which the secret anti-foreign organisation had

conferred upon itself. The full translation of the Chinese appeared to be 'The Righteous Harmony Fists,' and the idea conveyed by the name was that the members of the society would not hesitate, if needful, to use their weapons and even their clenched fists in the cause of what they understood to be righteous harmony. The society endeavoured to obtain special powers for the furtherance of their cause by the use of various incantations which were supposed to bring to their aid the assistance of supernatural power. The principles which the Boxers asserted were always a popular creed among the Chinese, but the society itself had only been regularly organised some five years before the events at which we have now arrived. The Dowager-Empress was understood to be in thorough sympathy with the objects of the Boxers and with their movement, and even when, in deference to the protests of English and other foreign Governments, the Chinese authorities issued an Imperial decree condemning the society, it was well understood that this decree was merely a sham performance, and that the Empress-Dowager would take good care that nothing should come of it.

The Boxers issued proclamations in which they declared that 'foreign devils' were invading the country with the doctrines of Christianity, and that converts to the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths were tolerated and becoming numerous; that telegraphs had been brought into the country, and that foreign cannon and rifles were manufactured

there, but that China still regarded the foreigners as barbarians upon whom Heaven frowned, and that it was the duty of all true Chinese to take measures that the foreigners should be extirpated in order that the purposes of Heaven should be carried out. The murders of missionaries went on ; the American missionary buildings at a place near Peking were attacked and burned, and some eighty-five native Christian converts were put to death. At last the anti-foreign movement broke out into something like actual war. Chinese forts fired on the ships of the allied squadron, and the allied squadron, composed of English, Russian, German, French, and Japanese warships, had nothing for it but to open a cannonade, thus after an engagement of some hours to reduce the forts to silence and then to send ashore force enough to capture and hold the forts. A little army of some 2500 men, made up from all the foreign nationalities, and commanded by the British Admiral Seymour, was sent to the relief of Peking. This little army met with much opposition and had to be strengthened by successive reinforcements to enable it to render some real service in the strange sort of civil war which was now going on.

Up to this time the Chinese Government still kept up the appearance of being hostile to the Boxers and anxious to protect the allied forces ; but it was none the less generally believed that the sympathy and connivance of the Empress-Dowager, and of many other great Chinese personages, were

secretly given to the anti-foreign movement. In Pekin itself the creed of the Boxers was finding its illustration, a very appropriate illustration, in continuing murders and even massacres. On June 11, M. Sugiyama, the Chancellor of the Japanese Legation, being unarmed and alone in one of the streets of the capital, was attacked and put to death by the soldiers of the Chinese General Tung. Railways and locomotives were destroyed, and the telegraph wires were cut. The Chinese authorities sent a deputation to wait upon the British Minister and make declarations to him of China's sincere friendship, with assurances that all the disturbance had been created by the action of fanatical mobs which had come from outside the city, and with the protestation that China regarded it as her sacred duty to protect the members of all the foreign Legations, whom she looked upon as her guests. Nothing came of this performance, although the authorised deputation assured the British Minister that effective steps had been taken for the suppression of all disturbance and that every danger was now over. The attacks on foreign buildings, on foreign property of whatever kind, and on the foreigners themselves, went on just as before. The Boxers were impartial in their destruction; they dealt with Protestant and Catholic Churches, and with the residences of the various foreign Legations, in the same way. Rescue parties were sent out by the allied forces of the foreigners, and con-

tinuous fighting was going on. One of these rescue parties succeeded in carrying away more than 1200 women and children belonging to foreigners settled in Peking, and placing them for safety in grounds near to the British Legation.

The Chinese authorities then announced to the foreign Ministers that the allied fleet had captured the Taku Forts on the 17th, and that this act could not be regarded otherwise than as a declaration of war. The authorities therefore informed the foreign Ministers that they must leave the capital, Peking, for Tien-tsin within twenty-four hours, as otherwise the safety of their lives could not be assured. The foreign diplomatists gave it as their reply that they must accept the declaration of war, but added that it would not be possible for them, with the present strength of their force near at hand, to secure the safe removal of the large number of women and children whom the Legations had to protect. They asked that the Ministers of the allied Powers might be received in the first instance by the Chinese authorities to make arrangements for a sufficient strength of protective escort. As no immediate answer came to this suggestion the foreign Ministers held a meeting at the French Legation to consider what steps ought to be taken. Suddenly the attention of the whole world was aroused by an extraordinary crime which took place before any definite arrangement had been made by the foreign diplomatic body with the Chinese authorities. This was the murder, on

the 20th, of the German Minister, Baron von Ketteler, as he was passing along one of the streets on his way to the Yarum in the open day accompanied by his secretary, Mr. Cordu. The crime was committed by a civil officer of the Chinese Government, a man who wore a full uniform, with a Mandarin's button and feather in his hat. This man fired a shot from his rifle which killed the German Minister on the spot; he then fired at the Minister's secretary, who was wounded, but was fortunate enough to escape from death in the confusion and tumult which followed.

Then all efforts at arrangements and all attempts at diplomatic negotiations between the foreign Ministers and the Chinese authorities came to an end. The foreign diplomatists knew that they were regarded as mere enemies, and that they had nothing for it but to defend themselves in the best way they could against the hostile and unscrupulous foes who surrounded them on all sides. The diplomatists sheltered themselves in their several Legations, and there, with whatever body of followers and with whatever arms and appliances they could bring together, prepared to defend themselves as if in so many beleaguered fortresses. How overwhelmingly the odds were against them will be clearly understood when it is mentioned that the whole strength of the guards under the control of the foreign diplomatists, British, American, Russian, French, German, Austrian, Italian, and Japanese, consisted of 18 officers and 389 men. The majority

of these guards were marines and sailors. It was soon found that the buildings of the Austrian and the American Legations were absolutely unsuited to maintain anything like defence against a serious assault by large numbers and they had to be abandoned. The British Legation was made up of a number of strong buildings and well-protected enclosures much better suited for the purposes of defence, and became the central point for the stand made by the threatened foreigners. Not only all the foreign Ministers with their families and their officials, but also the Christian missionaries and the Customs staff, to which many women and children were attached, had to be crowded within the high walls of the British Legation. It might be said that almost the whole of the foreign community sought for shelter within these walls. The small armed force at the service of the foreign diplomats, made a splendid defence. During nearly two months this beleaguered encampment, for it cannot be otherwise described, struggled with unflinching heroism against the assaults of the besiegers, and the besiegers were not merely made up of the rabble of Boxers, but were reinforced by the disciplined Chinese soldiers of one of the native Princes.

It may be doubted whether the history of the civilised world records any other event resembling that which then took place in the capital city of the Chinese Empire. The whole body of foreign diplomatists with their families and servants, the

foreign missionaries, and it may without exaggeration be said the whole Christian population domiciled in that region, were huddled up within the enclosure belonging to the British Minister for the sheer purpose of defence against the besieging force of the Chinese. When we think of a siege, even if our minds go back so far as the siege of Troy, we think of a regular state of open warfare between two hostile States or hostile peoples who have become and are acknowledged to be proclaimed enemies seeking each other's destruction according to the recognised usages of war. But here we have a siege going on in the capital of a State which up to the last moment had professed to be on terms of peace and of friendliness towards the foreign Powers represented there by Ministers formally received and welcomed according to the usages of civilisation. It was against those foreign diplomats and their families and retainers, including large numbers of women and children, residing within enclosures set apart for them by the Chinese Government, that this furious siege was carried on. The Chinese Government did not indeed proclaim themselves as the leaders of the siege, but they made no effort to interfere with the besiegers, and it is a fact that the besiegers were well supplied with Krupp guns and all the most powerful artillery of modern use which could hardly have been brought into the service of the Boxers if any effort had been made by the Chinese authorities to interfere with the fanatical work of destruction.

Meantime the besiegers were making every effort in their power to stop the supplies of food to the beleaguered foreigners, and these efforts were only too successful. The besieged enclosure sheltered nearly 3000 native Christians as well as the European men, women, and children belonging to or protected by the foreign Legations. It would be impossible to describe fully in words the sensation which was created all throughout Europe as the news of this horrifying struggle came in from day to day. After a while it became difficult or impossible for the European cities to receive any authentic and continuous news of what was going on in Peking. There were long interruptions lasting for days, and the European world held its breath in anxious suspense, not knowing what terror and wholesale calamity might not have been brought about to the defenders in this unparalleled siege. At one time it was believed all over Europe for several days that the whole British enclosure in Peking had been absolutely destroyed, and that the diplomatists and their families and all those to whom they gave shelter had been done to death. It may be doubted whether so long an interval of such great uncertainty was ever before or has ever since been experienced in England during the progress of any convulsive political or social struggle in a far off country. The English Government made up their minds that an expedition of some kind must be sent to march upon Peking, to save all that could be saved there, and endeavour to restore

something like good order. The idea of Lord Salisbury and his colleagues was that Japan from her nearness to the scene of struggle was the foreign Power which could best hope for success in a prompt effort to save the Legations in Peking, and that Great Britain should contribute towards the expedition all the forces which she had near to the scene of disturbance, and whatever financial help might be required. The plan of the English was, therefore, that Japan should lead the expedition; that the other foreign Powers represented in China should take part in it with such forces as they had there already; and that, if necessary, troops should be sent from Europe to accomplish the great work.

There was some delay in carrying out the proposal of the English Government. Russia at first did not see her way to follow the lead of Japan. Germany seemed for a while uncertain as to the possibility of securing a concerted and consistent action among so many Powers. Under the existing conditions it was not unlikely that such doubts and hesitations might arise, but under the existing conditions also it was absolutely necessary that if any rescue were to take place the rescuers must set about their work at once.

The expedition was got under way and started from Tien-tsin on the 4th of August 1900. The forces arrayed in this expedition were 10,000 Japanese with fifty-four guns, 4000 Russians with sixteen guns, 3000 British with twelve guns, 2000 Americans with six guns, 800 French with twelve

small guns, 200 Germans, and about 100 Austrians and Italians. The whole force consisted of some 20,100 men. The movements of the expedition were persistently opposed in its march to Peking by Chinese troops, who appeared to be well supplied with artillery and who had the comfortable advantage of fighting behind entrenchments. The allied forces had to fight their way from position to position, not without considerable loss to their numbers, and the soldiers suffered severely from the intense heat of the weather. On August 12, after little more than a week of steady pushing on, the allies captured Tung-chau, a place from which Peking was distant only about thirteen miles. The advance from that point was made in four separate parallel columns. The Japanese were earliest in arriving at the capital, and they might have entered Peking at once through its eastern gate, but that they were stopped by a large force of Chinese sharpshooters, who kept up a severe fire from the city wall. It was therefore the good fortune of the British column to be the first to enter the city, a success which they accomplished from the south side through the Tung-fuen Gate. The other columns of the allies made their way into the city by the capital soon after from different points. Then the struggle may be said to have come to an end. On the 26th of August the city was surrendered, and a detachment of the combined troops made a march through the capital in order to proclaim to the inhabitants and to the whole outer

world that the victory of the allies had been fully accomplished.

Before this event the Empress-Dowager and the Imperial Court had made their flight from Peking to a place of safety in one of the provinces. Then began the negotiations for peace. In the meantime the happy discovery was made that the massacre of those within the British enclosures, that massacre the report of which had horrified the civilised world, was but one of the inevitable rumours of the worst which are characteristic events of every such struggle. The Legation had been able to hold out to the last, and now the victorious forces of the allies were in a position to ensure their further safety and to receive their welcome. The terms of peace which the allied forces offered to China provided for the razing of certain forts, including the Taku Fort, which had been used for the work of destruction by the Chinese during the recent war and in former disturbances; the military occupation of points between Peking and the sea; the Viceroys to be held accountable for any future Boxer and other anti-foreign outbreaks, or for any violation of treaties; and the revision of commercial arrangements between China and the foreign Powers. It was further stipulated that a Chinese Imperial Prince should be sent to convey to Berlin the expression of the Chinese Government's regret for the murder of the German Minister. Another condition was the infliction of severe punishment on certain Chinese Princes and

on others of high rank who should be convicted of having directed or encouraged the attacks upon foreigners. Some reforms in the methods of Chinese Government were also insisted on as part of the conditions of peace.

Here this dismal story may be said to have come to an end so far at least as this History is concerned. It seems still very doubtful whether the whole of this strange tragedy might not have been avoided if the allied Powers could have decided upon their policy and measures more promptly, and could have found a more ready and full concert as to their plans and purposes from the beginning. It may also be questioned whether the various arrangements entered into, sometimes individually, sometimes in concert, by those Powers for the occupying of Chinese territory by lease should ever have been imposed as conditions on the Government of China. It is now clear that the whole Chinese Empire was to undergo a change from the sudden operation of the new conditions which had arisen in the Far East. The most important and most revolutionary of these new conditions arose from the fact that Japan was becoming a great rising State governed by a policy exactly the opposite of that which had been the sacred creed of the Chinese Empire. China had ever regarded it as a religious duty to keep her soil clear, so far as she could, from the supposed contagion of European or other modern improvement; from the invasion of the newer culture; from the intrusion of European

science, art, and thought; to keep to her own old ways and let the rest of the world go on its vain and giddy mission.

Japan, the nearest neighbour of China, had become filled with a passionate longing not merely to learn everything that was new, but to excel in everything that was new; to make herself mistress of all Western sciences and arts—the art and science of military and naval war among the rest—to become the rival and the superior of Europe in Europe's own accomplishments. She had within a few years already made greater changes in her modes of life than had been achieved by countries like England or the United States within half a century. It is perfectly possible that China and Japan might have got on quite well as neighbours for an indefinite time if China had had nothing of her own which Japan cared to possess, but China had a vast territory with far-stretching lines of shore, and many most convenient and almost idle seaports, on which Japan had long cast the eyes of desire. Japan began the work of occupying Chinese territory, and the moment that work began it became perfectly certain that some of the European States would take rival parts in it. If Japan would go in, then Russia would go in, and when Russia adopted such a policy England and Germany and France felt called upon to follow the example. Therefore when the peace with China had been signed by the foreign Ministers and the summer palace in Peking transferred to the Chinese Govern-

ment, the Imperial Court returned once more to Peking, with the Dowager-Empress again supreme and blandly receiving at her Court the wives of foreign Ministers with the assurance of her regrets for recent troubles and her hopes for peace and progress—when all this had been gone through, there could have been but little hope in the mind of the intelligent observer that this particular chapter of history had been closed and was to be followed by no fresh and startling developments. This modern movement has still to run its course.

It may be admitted in the meantime as some sort of excuse for the apparent duplicity and the evident inconsistency of the Chinese policy and the Chinese rulers, for the fair promises made to the invaders and the secret encouragement given to those who endeavoured by the rudest and most savage deeds to frighten back the invasion, that the Chinese authorities found themselves encountered by difficulties such as could never have been known to their predecessors. The anti-foreign movement had the support of the great mass of the Chinese populations, and the rulers were utterly perplexed in their efforts to discover how they could manage to hold their places between the forces from within and the forces from without. There has been many a crisis in the affairs of European States when the rulers of those States have found themselves tempted into a policy of duplicity, and have even yielded to the temptation, while endeavouring to maintain their thrones.

They have been distracted between the policy popular at home and the policy pressed upon them by the menaces of foreign invasion, and the conquest of their thrones and their territories by the foreign invaders. We are not offering any excuse for the inconsistencies and treacheries of the Chinese rulers, but only suggest that these rulers might, if they had consulted or felt inclined to consult European history, have found there historic precedents for duplicity and treachery, and for the encouragement of popular passion to deeds of violence and organisations of crime as a possible means of resisting the incursions of conquering invaders. For all that has come and gone there may still be some hope that China and modern civilisation can yet be reconciled and live in healthful co-operation and development.

The responsibilities of England had been growing during this time in Egypt as well as in China. There have not been for several generations many successive months during which the public attention of England was not alarmed or at least aroused by sudden and disturbing events in Egypt. England might be relied upon to come successfully out of each of these troubles in its turn, but it is always to be observed that each success, however complete and satisfying for the time, brings with it an immediate increase of British responsibility and the assurance of new dangers and a wider extension of territory in the future. Egypt in fact is a British sphere of influence, which opens out

to the British Government an ever-widening and limitless sphere of trouble. On the 2nd of September 1898 another chapter in the long history of England's Egyptian progress was brought to a close by the battle of Omdurman. That battle was fought between the combined British and Egyptian troops under the command of Sir Herbert Kitchener and the forces of the Dervishes, as they are called, who were fighting for the native rulers of Egypt. Early in the year Sir Herbert Kitchener, the keenest observer of events within his sphere, believed he had good reason to know that the Dervishes were cautiously but steadily making preparations for a disturbing movement at some moment which might seem opportune to them.

The Dervishes of our recent days acquired for the name of their order a peculiar significance which in its earlier history it was never meant to express. The word 'Dervish' meant in its original Persian nothing more than to qualify a man as one of those who in all countries are considered poor. But in the history of all political struggles and international wars we find that the simplest and plainest name often comes to be invested with a meaning having nothing to do with its original purpose. During the revolt of the Netherlands against the dominion of Spain there was a gallant band of fighters on the side of freedom who were known as 'the beggars,' but whose ranks were not composed altogether of persons belonging to the mendicant order, and 'the Camisards' of

another date and another region were not understood to be absolutely exceptional in their adoption of shirts as undergarments. In the same way the forces which are described as Dervishes in our later Egyptian campaigns are not understood to have been living types of poverty and sanctity. Sir Herbert Kitchener took early notice of their plans and movements. He sent for large reinforcements from Cairo, and before many weeks he had organised a powerful military force on the banks of the Nile. There was a Soudan railway at this time to help the British movements, and in the early days of April 1898 they attacked the entrenched camp of the Dervishes, which held a force described in all the accounts of the battle as numbering nearly 10,000 men. Kitchener's army, according to the reports received by the British authorities, killed at least 3000 Dervishes, captured 3000 more, and made the leader of the Dervish band, Mahmoud, a prisoner.

This stimulated Sir Herbert Kitchener to make a fresh advance and to prepare for the final victory. His preparations were carefully and steadily made, and Kitchener contemplated nothing short of a direct attack on the Khalifa himself, who was now regarded as the leader of the whole movement. The determination of the British General was to make Khartoum, the capital of Nubia at the confluence of the Blue and White Nile, the point of his final attack. The forces of the Khalifa are described as having numbered more than 60,000 at that point,

including in their mass some of the most warlike tribes known to that region, and were, it was said, well supplied with artillery. The English troops only numbered some 23,000 men. At Omdurman the great battle took place. The Dervishes came out to meet and encounter the British troops, but after more than one long and desperate fight the skill and tactics of the British force, with an unfailing discipline and unbroken courage, accomplished a complete success over their enemies. At last the Dervishes, or as many of them as were left of that force, which, to do it justice, had fought for a long time with splendid bravery, underwent a complete defeat, and had to disperse and fly from the scene of action. The flight soon became an utter rout. Sir Herbert Kitchener entered Omdurman a triumphant conqueror, and on the Sunday following, September 4, a thanksgiving service was held within Khartoum, and the British and the Egyptian flag were displayed side by side over the shattered citadel where Gordon had closed his gallant and devoted life. The whole struggle was so well conducted by the British commander that the losses were comparatively few. It is well to record the fact, as characteristic of the events of modern warfare, that among those who were killed on the British side was Mr. Hubert Howard, one of the war correspondents of *The Times* newspaper.

The victory prepared with such foresight and worked out with such skill by Sir Herbert Kitchener and his officers, and accomplished with such bravery

by his men, was accepted in England, according to a contemporary narrator, as 'the destruction of the Dervish power and the re-conquest for civilisation of the whole of the Egyptian Soudan.' The re-conquest for civilisation of the whole of the Soudan must of course be taken as the natural expression of the British triumph over the complete defeat of the enemy. The victor in such a case regards his triumph as a conquest or a re-conquest in the interests of civilisation; but there were many intelligent and patriotic Englishmen at home and abroad who felt grave doubts as to whether the interests of civilisation and of Christianity are greatly and lastingly advanced by the mere work of conquering new territory and winning new victories on African battlefields. Even if civilisation were sure to follow rapidly and steadily after such conquests as those which England achieved in the Soudan, it is not by any means certain that the spread of civilisation by armed force is worth all the risks and sacrifices which it brings upon the conquerors as well as the conquered. We have also to bear in mind that during the wars of invasion recorded in the history of the past, wars some of which now seem to us, indeed to all readers of history, utterly unjustifiable and productive of nothing but harmful results, the same proclamation was invariably made by the victors, that the whole work was undertaken with the object of spreading civilisation, the teaching of sound morality and the doctrines of true religion. There

was, throughout the British Empire, a sense of peculiar satisfaction because of this victory at Khartoum. The feeling was that Gordon had at last been avenged, and that the place which had seen his murder had now become the scene of the vengeance inflicted for that murder. There were some eloquent sentences written at the time about the gratitude and pride which the soul of Gordon might be supposed to feel at this testimonial of homage offered up to him by his fellow-countrymen. Some of us may be excused if, judging by what we have learned and know concerning Gordon, we are much inclined to doubt whether such a soul as his was likely to be propitiated by such a sacrifice.

When the struggle with the Dervishes had thus been brought to an end, Sir Herbert Kitchener returned to England, where he was received with a national welcome which was only in proportion with the splendid services he had rendered, his marvellous foresight, his patient organisation of details, and the efforts he had always made that there should be as little waste of human life on either side as was possible under the conditions of the work he had to accomplish. He received from the Queen the title of Lord Kitchener of Khartoum, and even those of his countrymen who had felt least sympathy with the policy of conquest and extended territory in Egypt freely admitted that the manner in which he had done the work confided to him amply deserved such recognition from his Sovereign. Lord Kitchener believed that he had still some work to

do in connection with Khartoum and its memories, and he made use of the first opportunity offered to him in accomplishing this characteristic task. He was entertained at a banquet by the Lord Mayor of London, and presented there with the freedom of the city and a sword of honour. Lord Kitchener then and there invited the British public to raise a fund of £100,000 in order to found and endow a college for the education of Egyptians and Soudanese to be built at Khartoum as an appropriate memorial of Gordon. The proposal met with an enthusiastic welcome, and when Lord Kitchener returned to Egypt he was able to bear with him the whole of the sum needed for the founding of this institution. Lord Kitchener may be congratulated on having raised the noblest and the most appropriate monument to the memory of the hero Gordon on that very ground which Lord Kitchener's military exploit had made available for the purpose. This was indeed just the sort of revenge which would have been most in sympathy with the heart of Gordon himself.

The Fashoda incident, as it was called, belongs strictly to this part of our narrative, although it had no direct connection with Lord Kitchener's campaign. Fashoda marks a point on the Nile in the Egyptian Soudan farther south than Omdurman and Khartoum. In one of the expeditions along the Nile during the campaign, Lord Kitchener—we may call him by his historic title although it had not yet been conferred on him—was made aware that some

white men, to all appearance a military force, were in occupation of Fashoda and that the French flag was flying there. Lord Kitchener acted with his usual promptitude. From the information he received he had come to the conclusion that the white men constituted a force under the command of the French officer, Major Marchand, from the French Congo region. Major Marchand, it appears, had been put at the head of an exploring enterprise by the French Government, and was no doubt on the lookout for new realms which the French Republic could conquer and annex. There appears to have been a sort of unwritten international law, or at least a national understanding, that European and other States were free to send expeditions of this kind exploring through the unsettled and unannexed regions of Egypt. If these came upon some territory which seemed to suit their purposes, and was not under the dominion of any other European State, it would be free to them to make it their own if it were a desert or if the dwellers on its soil, supposing it to be inhabited, did not make any objection to the annexation, or proved unable to maintain their objection by force of arms. Now there could not be the slightest question as to the fact that Fashoda formed some of the territory which England, acting as the co-partner of the Egyptian ruler, regarded as part of her dominion and under the protection of the British and the Egyptian flag. Lord Kitchener at once went up the Nile with a flotilla of gun-boats and a military

force. He found that Major Marchand was actually in occupation of Fashoda, and that the French flag was floating there. Lord Kitchener informed Major Marchand that that part of the world was strictly Egyptian and therefore under British protection, and he politely but firmly invited Major Marchand to take himself, his force, and his flag into some region unclaimed by any responsible Power. Major Marchand informed Lord Kitchener that the French force and the French flag were there by the orders of the French Government, and that he could not withdraw from the place without authority from Paris.

The discussions between the English commander and the French officer were conducted, as might be expected, with great politeness on both sides, although we may feel sure that Lord Kitchener left no doubt on the mind of Major Marchand as to his determination to enforce if necessary the claims of England and Egypt. Lord Kitchener ordered that the flags of England and of Egypt should be at once displayed, but with a cool judgment and foresight which were part of his character he resolved to leave the further settlement of the question to the diplomacy of England and France for the moment at all events. Some recently published accounts of the Fashoda incident go so far as to profess to describe the interchange of civilities which took place between Lord Kitchener and Major Marchand while they were discussing the question of ownership. Lord Kitchener was known to be a man of plain

and quite unostentatious habits, and according to these recent accounts he offered Major Marchand, who had come to visit him, some whisky and water as part of his refreshment. On the other hand, according to the same authorities, when Lord Kitchener visited Major Marchand that gallant officer entertained him at a repast which included champagne of the best brand. If Major Marchand proved himself the more profuse and fashionable host, there can be no doubt that Lord Kitchener proved himself to be the more successful disputant.

Lord Kitchener had in the meanwhile other work to do, and he therefore quietly established a Sudanese garrison at Fashoda under the command of one of his English officers, and went on to his other duties, having duly informed the British Government of the course he had taken. Little or nothing was known of these transactions even at Khartoum for some time after Lord Kitchener's occupation of the place. The British commander had no desire to take the outer world into his confidence at such a critical moment, and he left the settlement of the question in the hands of his Government at home. For a time the diplomatic business was carried on very quietly, and the English public had little suspicion of the fact that a very important international crisis was close at hand. On the 10th of October 1898 the opening part of the story was fully told by Her Majesty's Government. This revelation—it was at the time a very startling revelation—was made in a Parliamentary paper

containing the despatches which had passed, thus far, between the English Government and that of France. These despatches showed that the English statesmen had long been suspicious of some design on the part of the French Government to get possession of Fashoda. On December 10, 1897, Sir Edmund Monson, British Ambassador at Paris, had been instructed by his Government to make an important statement to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs. This statement had to do with negotiations which were then going on as to the recognition of France's claim to the northern and eastern shores of Lake Tchad. Sir Edmund Monson was instructed to state that the Queen's Government must not be understood to admit that any other Power than Great Britain could claim to occupy any part of the valley of the Nile. That was the declaration of 1897.

In 1898 the British Ambassador at Paris was authorised to tell the Government of the French Republic that England was determined strictly to maintain her policy as already announced. The British Ambassador was instructed to make his statements still more emphatic by informing the French Minister for Foreign Affairs that the present occupants of the Treasury Bench in England adhered absolutely to the language used by their predecessors in office so far back as the early part of 1895. During that year Sir Edward Grey, who was then Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs

in a Liberal Administration, declared in the House of Commons that a French advance into the Nile Valley would be regarded by England as 'an unfriendly action,' and we all know what these words mean when gravely spoken by official lips. Sir Edward Grey spoke them with all the more authority because, although Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons, he absolutely represented the Government there inasmuch as his chief, Lord Rosebery, had a seat only in the House of Lords. Therefore when the Conservative Government announced so decisively that it was their intention to persevere in the proclaimed policy of their predecessors, the French Government must have understood thoroughly that if England and France could not come to a satisfactory decision as to the ownership of Fashoda the dispute must be referred to the arbitrament of war.

After the fall of Khartoum Lord Salisbury directed the English Ambassador in Paris to inform the French Government distinctly that the Fashoda region was now subject by the right of conquest to the British and Egyptian Governments, and that the question was therefore not open to any further discussion. The French Government still spoke in a very hesitating manner, and seemed inclined to argue that Major Marchand was only acting as an explorer on the part of France, with the object of endeavouring to promote French interests in the north-east of Egypt. The French Foreign Minister, M. Delcassé, put

in blandly the somewhat telling argument that France in advancing towards the Nile was only following the example of England, who, for her part, was undertaking the conquest of the Equatorial Province. This might have been a telling point if the whole dispute were merely an argument carried on in a debating society, but it does not do much towards lessening the chances of war if the representative of one Power engaged in a dispute tells the representative of the opposing Power that his principals are in their schemes of annexation only following the example set to them by the Government of the rival State. The question became the more serious when telegrams were received by the British Government from Lord Kitchener announcing that Major Marchand declared that he had received instructions from the French Government to occupy the territory in question and to hoist the French flag over the Government quarters at Fashoda. Major Marchand qualified the statement by saying that under these circumstances it was impossible for him to withdraw from the place without the express orders of his Government, which he expected would not long be delayed. The French Government still seemed unwilling to take any decisive steps for the recall of Major Marchand, and at last it became clear to the whole English public that there was every danger of an actual war between England and France.

Then was seen what is not often seen in this

country, a sudden and complete agreement between the Liberal leaders and the Conservative leaders as to the necessity of making a stand side by side for the maintenance of what they regarded as national claims and national interests. Lord Rosebery spoke out clearly. There was at the time no recognised peace party in the House of Commons like to that which existed in the days of Cobden and Bright, and the speeches made by leading Liberals and by leading Conservatives spoke out the same determination to maintain England's claims, even by war, if France did not at once recede from the position she seemed to have taken up. The strong feeling thus manifested through England had its effect on the hesitating action of the French Government. The result was what might have been expected by all reasonable men in France as well as in England. Whatever may be thought of the abstract right of France to push on for new territorial possessions in North Africa, and however reasonably it might be argued that France had as good a right as England to seek for new possessions there, it is clear that neither the claim of the French to Fashoda nor the interests she supposed herself to have in acquiring new territory throughout that region would have been worth the terrible risks of a war with England.

The French Government at last made up their minds. The Marchand expedition was recalled in the early November of 1899, and Fashoda

was evacuated by the French emissary in the December following. A profound sense of relief was felt in both countries, and indeed throughout Europe, when the dispute thus came to an end. It is no part of our task here to consider the higher and moral aspects involved in the controversy or to philosophise as to the relative value of the claims made by England and France for the ownership of Egyptian territory or of territory claimed by Egypt. We must all alike feel free to express our satisfaction that England and France were not led into a war which, however it might have ended, must for the time have been calamitous to the highest interests of England, of France, and of civilisation. The whole 'Fashoda incident' was not worth the trouble it cost, but we have the satisfaction of knowing that it must have cost infinitely greater trouble if the French Government had not given way just in time.

•

CHAPTER VII.

‘HOW WE HAVE PERFORMED OUR ROMAN RITES.’

THE regulation of public worship in the Church of England began now to be once again a subject of vehement controversy. The introduction of what were called Ritualistic practices into the Church of England—practices which those who condemned them declared to have been borrowed from the Church of Rome—had long been imputed to a certain class of clergymen in the State Church. These practices had been condemned in several episcopal charges, in reports of a commission appointed to inquire into the subject, and by the judicial committee of the Privy Council. In August 1874 a measure was carried through Parliament called the ‘Public Worship Regulation Act,’ with the direct object of repressing Ritualism in the Church of England. On the other hand it is almost needless to say that the ceremonials, usages, and emblems denounced as Ritualistic were maintained, supported, and revered by many clergymen of the English Church on the ground that they were in full accord with the teaching

of that Church and were animated by its true spirit. Volumes of argument were poured forth on this subject from either side of the dispute; conferences and congresses were held in Great Britain and in the United States, with the hope of securing a settlement of the controversy; the peace of neighbourhoods and of families was often disturbed by the quarrels between the Ritualists and the anti-Ritualists. It might have seemed, indeed, as if, when the country had nothing else to dispute about, it must always go to work in warm discussion over the manner in which the English State Church conducted its forms of worship.

In the closing years of the Queen's reign the controversy which Parliament had vainly endeavoured to settle came up all over again. Perhaps we ought to say that it hardly ever disappeared altogether from public sight for a long interval; but just before the time with which we are now dealing it had fallen back a little from public observation until a measure introduced into the House of Commons gave a convenient opportunity for its revival. The Government had brought in, early in March 1898, a measure on the subject of Benefices, which had been already discussed very carefully by the Standing Committee on Law; but when this Bill and Mr. Lyttelton's, which had come from the Standing Committee as one Bill, came up for discussion in June, it was expected that the measure would pass through the

House of Commons without much opposition. But the very fact that the proposed measure did not deal directly with what may be called the Ritualistic question was dwelt upon by some speakers in the course of the debate as an especial reason for opposing the scheme of the Government. A motion was made on June 20 for the rejection of the Bill on the ground that, while professing to be a measure of Church reform, it did not undertake to deal with any of the reforms which many members of the House regarded as most needful. During the debate several speakers raised the whole subject of Ritualism, and contended that the growth of practices strictly belonging to the Church of Rome was one of the evils from which the English Church ought to be rescued, and that no measure of so-called reform which did not deal with those practices was worthy of attention. One speaker actually insisted that the object of those who were introducing such practices into Protestant churches was to destroy the character of the English Church altogether, and to prepare the way for its absorption into the Church of Rome.

The debate received a peculiar significance and importance from the part which was taken in it by so powerful a debater and so influential a statesman as Sir William Vernon Harcourt. Sir William Harcourt went so far as to declare that there was just then something amounting to a conspiracy in the English State Church to over-

throw the principles of the Reformation, and he cited in support of his view a statement made by one of the Bishops in convocation a few days before. The Bishop was reported to have expressed his conviction that secret societies existed in the Church of England with the object of overthrowing the principles of the Protestant Reformation. Sir William Harcourt appears to have accepted to the full the declaration made by this Bishop, and in language of almost impassioned eloquence he denounced those who, while actually within the Church, were developing plans for its restoration to the principles and practices of Rome. He complained that the Bishops and Clergy in general had not been active and steadfast enough in their efforts to restrain or punish those members of the English Church who were endeavouring to work out this conspiracy, and he contended that it had become all the more the duty of the House of Commons to interpose on behalf of the country, and protect it against the threatened evil.

There could be no doubt that a speech of this kind, delivered by a statesman of Sir William Harcourt's position, must lend an incalculable importance to the subject then under discussion. Sir William Harcourt was well known to be a man of strong opinions on many or most subjects. He was certainly a man who, if he thought a question worth studying at all, was sure to study it very carefully, and to make up his mind to a definite conclusion concerning it. But he never had been

known as a fanatical sectarian in any sense of the words, and he never could have been regarded as an enemy to the fullest development of religious liberty. He explained in the course of his speech that while condemning certain clergymen of the English Church, he was not condemning them for any opinions they might have sincerely and deliberately formed, but that he found fault with them because, while enjoying the benefices of the State Church, they were endeavouring to introduce into its Ritual the practices of the Church of Rome. The speech provoked at the time, as was but natural, much hostile criticism, and some of the criticism took the form of sarcastic allusions to the zeal which, according to the critics, Sir William Harcourt had so suddenly developed for the cause of true religion. No doubt Sir William Harcourt was generally associated in the public mind with questions of a purely secular nature, with measures of finance, with reforms of the law, and with great international controversies involving the issues of freedom and of servitude, of war and peace. The fact, therefore, of his showing such earnestness and even passion in his opposition to Ritualistic practices gave to the revived controversy an additional interest and importance.

Mr. Arthur Balfour replied on behalf of the Government. He began his speech with an effort to bring back the House to the consideration of the actual measure then before it, and to prevail

upon members to consider it on its own merits, to judge of it by what it proposed to do, and to decide whether or not its clauses were effective for this particular purpose. This would have been all very well if the Government were introducing a Bill embodying certain definite alterations in existing law, and if the House had been satisfied that such a measure covered all the ground of reform which Parliamentary parties were demanding. But when a measure was brought forward to introduce a reform in the practices of the Church of England, it was only natural and fair for any member to insist that if her Majesty's Ministers proposed to introduce any measure of Church reform they ought to deal with the questions of greatest importance, and not deliberately to confine their legislation to subjects of minor public interest. Mr. Balfour then went on to reply to the speech of Sir William Harcourt, whom he described sarcastically as revelling in popular excitement, and he fell foul of several of Sir William's arguments, and insisted that the dangers to the faith of the children of Nonconformists and Churchmen were utterly exaggerated. At the same time he admitted that the Ritualistic practices of many clergymen were actually illegal, and that he had himself always been anxious for some clear and decisive definition of the law which should absolutely disallow the introduction of such a ritual into the State Church. But he contended that the present was not the fitting occasion for a dis-

cussion of that large subject, and he strongly appealed to the House not to be led away from the quiet discussion of the limited measure before it into a heated debate on the whole subject of Ritualism. The appeal appears to have had a great effect upon the House. The debate had arisen on an amendment proposed by a member who avowed himself an anti-Ritualist, but when the division came to be taken, only 75 votes, besides those of the proposer and Sir William Harcourt, were given in its favour.

Next day the storm broke out again with additional fierceness. An amendment was proposed which affirmed that power ought to be given to every Bishop to refuse to institute any clergyman who 'taught doctrines contrary to or inconsistent with the Thirty-Nine Articles, or participated in ecclesiastical practices not authorised by the Book of Common Prayer.' The Attorney-General, Sir Richard Webster, opposed the amendment on the ground that it was entirely unnecessary, because the actual law could deal with any offences against the doctrine of Ritual, and he begged the members who sat on the Opposition benches not to fill themselves with the idea that they enjoyed a monopoly of Protestant enthusiasm. This sarcastic touch was effective in its way, but the Attorney-General seemed to have forgotten for the moment that on the benches of Opposition were a great many members who did not approve of the amendment, and who did not

recognise Sir William Harcourt as a decisive authority on questions of Protestant doctrine. The Attorney-General went on to say that he regretted as much as any one could do the supineness of some Bishops in dealing with Ritualistic practices, and for himself he strongly condemned such practices.

Sir William Harcourt again took a leading part, and asked whether it was consistent with what we understand as honour, that men who enjoyed the emoluments and preferments, and who exercised the authority which belonged to ordained clergymen of the Church of England, should stand up and, amid the applause of surrounding ecclesiastics, make such statements as were lately made at a meeting of the English Church Union. Sir William quoted several passages from speeches made on that occasion, and dwelt with especial emphasis on one passage, in which it was set forth that clergymen were ordained, 'not as members of the Church of England, but as Priests of the Catholic Church of God.' He described at some length, and with much effect, the ceremonials conducted in certain London and suburban churches, and he reminded the House that the Church of England is not composed merely of Bishops and Clergy, but must be considered as including also a lay population on whom the evil teachings of spiritual directors might have a most disastrous effect. The existing arrangements, he went on to say, 'have planted down in a parish and imposed upon an adult laity practices which are repugnant

to all their feelings and to all their convictions, and if the Bishops do not choose to interfere, the people have no remedy ; they are driven away from their church.' Finally he declared that there were still even worse results, for 'you have children of Protestant parents corrupted by these men who not merely teach them lessons abhorrent to the religious convictions of their parents, but who are in themselves living examples of dishonour and falsehood, and who demoralise all those among whom they live—whose existence is in itself a living lie.'

This speech from Sir William Harcourt, like his speech of the previous day, was well qualified to create a profound sensation in the House of Commons. It had indeed a somewhat startling effect. No one could doubt that the orator was thoroughly in earnest, and no one could fairly say that, if the whole question were looked upon from the orator's point of view, there was any exaggeration in the language he employed. Mr. Balfour replied to the leader of the Opposition in a speech of measured, and, it might even be said, ingenious, calmness and moderation. He declined altogether to follow Sir William Harcourt into what he described as the theological arena, but he ventured so far into that arena as to express his frank condemnation of Ritualistic extravagances. He maintained, however, that there was not the slightest danger that certain practices prevailing in this or that particular Church could revolutionise the

religious convictions of the mass of the English people. The main purport of Mr. Balfour's speech, and for his especial object its most effective passage, was contained in the words, 'Profoundly as I disapprove of the kind of ceremony of which the right honourable gentleman read us a detailed account as having taken place in a Church in South London, I confess that to see them tossed across the floor of this House and made the subject of laughter, and made to give point to some Parliamentary retort, offends myself to a degree which I do not feel easy to express, and which absolutely prevents my following, at all events, in the wake of the right honourable gentleman in dealing with matters which, whatever our opinions may be on them, at any rate represent sacred truths.'

This was much the most effective line Mr. Balfour could have taken under all the conditions. There could be no doubt that some of Sir William Harcourt's citations, and the telling manner in which he delivered them, were calculated to bring shouts of derisive laughter from the opponents of Ritualism, and to provoke even unmannerly interruptions from those who held the contrary opinions. The result of the debate was that the amendment was defeated, 215 votes being given against it while only 103 were given in its favour. Still, the effect of the whole discussion was substantially a gain to the anti-Ritualistic party. On the one side it was made quite clear that anti-Ritualism was now beginning to have a strong and outspoken party

in Parliament as well as outside it, and, on the other hand, it was made equally clear that many who had hitherto favoured the cause of Ritualism were beginning to reconsider their position.

Sir William Harcourt did not desist from his efforts to make Ritualism hateful to the British public, even when he had no opportunity of expressing his opinions in the House of Commons. He spoke on popular platforms with a vehemence and passion which carried his audiences along with him, and stirred their emotions too strongly to give them much chance for the consideration of mere practical argument. Moreover, he appealed again and again to the country through the columns of the *Times*, and his letters were read by numbers who did not in the least accept their theological dictation merely because of their eloquence and their captivating phraseology. Sir William Harcourt's creed upon the whole subject was quite distinct and explicit. He maintained that the Ritualistic movement was an organised and deliberate conspiracy on the part of a large number of the English State Church clergy for the conversion of that Church into a branch of the Church of Rome. That was his text, and on that text he delivered many a telling sermon through the columns of the *Times*. For no inconsiderable time he became the most conspicuous, and, in a certain sense, the most interesting figure in public debate. Much of that interest was not due to the subject in itself, or to the man in himself, but was due to the natural wonder felt by many as to

why such a man should have given himself up to such a subject. It was not generally assumed that Sir William Harcourt had devoted any great part of his life to the study of theology. On one occasion, already mentioned in this History, Sir William, who had spoken in the House of Commons on a question connected with Church discipline, was satirically described by Mr. Gladstone as having astonished the House by display of portentous erudition got up since the adjournment a day or two before the debate on the same question. But every one who knew anything of Sir William Harcourt's capacity for work knew well that he had a marvellous faculty for 'getting up' a subject when once he threw his heart and mind into it. He certainly threw his heart and mind into this particular subject for the time. Naturally his new-born zeal led him sometimes into rather curious over-statement or inaccurate statement of his case. He spoke of the Ritualists as carrying on a conspiracy for the betrayal of the English Church to Rome, but surely never was a conspiracy carried on in so public and even ostentatious a fashion as that in which, according to Sir William Harcourt, the Ritualists were conducting theirs.

In more than one of his speeches and letters Sir William had made allusion to the part played by Lord Halifax, President of the English Church Union, as a leader of the movement. Whatever may be thought of the course taken by Lord Hali-

fax, there did not seem to be much about it of that secrecy which is generally regarded as one of conspiracy's essential conditions. Another Lord Halifax, the famous 'Trimmer,' once wrote satirically of certain conspirators who carried on their plots so noisily that they seemed to him like folks engaged in trapping birds who always made their approach so audible as to frighten away the birds before the nests could be reached. The Lord Halifax of our times, if he were engaged in a conspiracy, certainly carried it on in such a manner as to secure the widest possible publicity. He had devoted himself in speeches and writings to what he believed to be the possible and ultimate reconciliation of the Church of England with the Church of Rome, and with this object in view, and openly proclaimed, he visited the Pope in Rome, by whom he had been received, and, we may presume, obtained a hearing for his suggestions. These visits were recorded and described in every newspaper throughout the civilised world, and there is no reason to suppose that Lord Halifax shrank from this publicity.

The truth of the matter is, that in the English State Church there had long been growing up an organisation, religious in part, æsthetic in part, for the beautifying and solemnising of Church ceremonial. Throughout the whole history of human growth we find a constant competition, not to say antagonism, between the tendency towards the practical and the tendency towards the beautiful.

One order of mind is content with that which carries on the business of life to its practical issues ; the other must ever strive that the progress of the work shall be illumined by some rays of artistic beauty. This contrast of tendencies finds natural illustration in the conduct of Church ceremonial. One worshipper is quite satisfied if the strict rules of his liturgy be carried out ; another yearns also for its artistic illustration. It is not probable that the larger proportion of the English Ritualists ever seriously entertained the ideas of Lord Halifax as to the possibility of an ultimate reconciliation between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, but the feeling common to the whole body may be regarded as a yearning for a greater symbolic beauty and expressiveness in the ceremonial of the English Church. Still, the fact that such a movement as that led by Lord Halifax was going on would do much to explain the alarm and anger felt by a large number of the Protestant community at the adoption of so many ceremonials, and so much illustration in words and music from the Ritual of the Church of Rome by Church of England clergymen, and the disinclination of the English Bishops to exercise their authority for the discouragement, if not the actual repression, of these innovations in Protestant worship.

It has to be remembered that the full extent of the powers which the Bishops could exercise was not very clearly defined by the law, and any active steps taken by a ruling ecclesiastic would be sure to

lead to long, troublesome, and, it might be, futile proceedings in courts of law. The old familiar question would again present itself to men's minds, the question whether any Church is well served by having its ceremonials subjected to the inquisition and the decision of a court of law in a country like England, where freedom of conscience is no longer supposed to be measured out by legal, even although it bear the name of ecclesiastical, tribunals. Sir William Harcourt insisted more than once in his speeches and writings that the course for an individual clergyman to follow was perfectly obvious. If he were not content with the forms of worship which his Church allowed and sanctioned, was it not open to him to renounce that Church and seek for some form of religion consorting better with his own personal convictions? But it must be said that the Ritualistic clergyman did not admit that he was doing anything in opposition to or inconsistent with the teaching and authority of his Church. He contended that his reading of the Church's doctrine was the true and authorised rendering, and that those who, like Sir William Harcourt, denounced him were only proving thereby that they themselves did not justly interpret the doctrine of the Church. There again came in the dispute, which could only be settled, even for the moment, by a legal tribunal; and who could possibly suppose that the decision of any legal tribunal could settle it for ever?

The difficulties surrounding the whole question

were effectively illustrated by debates which took place in both Houses of Parliament soon after the opening of the Session of 1899. On February 9 the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Randall Davidson, brought the subject directly under the consideration of the House of Lords. The House of Lords is emphatically an appropriate scene for the introduction of such a question, for one reason, because it can always provide an audience of Bishops, and for another reason because it has not an audience composed to a large extent of rather impatient and worldly-minded members who might mar by their interruptions the solemnity of the debate. The Bishop of Winchester began by calling attention to statements lately made respecting the action of the Bishops in dealing with irregularities in public worship. Then, as might be expected, he went on to reply to some of the statements made by Sir William Harcourt. He contended that the Bishops had never shrunk from exercising their authority if they believed it could safely be exerted with regard to the best interests of the Church. He went very minutely into an examination of some of the instances on which Sir William Harcourt had relied in support of his assertions, instances that at the present time would have but little interest for the reader. The most effective, and in the historical sense suggestive, part of the Bishop's speech was that part in which he told the House of Lords that prosecutions had ceased because the Church at large—

Low as well as High—was against them. This declaration drew out one of the peers, Lord Kinnaird, who had recently presided at a public meeting held for the purpose of protesting against the toleration of Ritualistic practices in the Church of England. Lord Kinnaird gave a number of figures to show that such illegal practices were greatly on the increase, and that no serious effort was made by the Church authorities to prevent or even to discourage them. He maintained that the only subjects of the Crown precluded from seeking redress at the hands of the law were the aggrieved members of the Church of England.

The Bishop of London, Dr. Creighton, enlivened the House by a very animated attack on Sir William Harcourt, whose letters he described as much more amusing than instructive. Sir William, according to Dr. Creighton, had drawn an imaginary picture of a Church entirely riddled by the insidious treachery of a traitorous crew and managed by a body of craven and feeble-minded Bishops, until in this universal disaster there suddenly stepped forth the colossal figure of a new Elijah denouncing judgment but at the same time clamouring that somebody else, of course one of the Bishops, should take off his hands the trouble of slaying the priests of Baal. Then Dr. Creighton went on to say that if the Bishops had been to blame at all, they had been to blame merely because they had acted rather as

Englishmen than as ecclesiastics. He reminded the House of Lords that in the mind of the ordinary Englishman prosecution, as far as religious actions were concerned, was very closely associated with persecution, and those who were engaged in administering the affairs of the Church must ever bear in mind that the public opinion which goaded them on to prosecute their clergy would be the very first to desert them, and hold them up to derision when once they undertook the duties thus pressed upon them. Dr. Creighton did not by any means admit that because the Bishops were not inclined to prosecute they were therefore doing nothing to remove the dangers which troubled the Church and the public. He contended that they were doing their very best to bring about a good understanding in all parishes where an appeal had been made to their intervention, and that in most of the country dioceses all questions of disputed Ritual were settled by the mediation of the Bishops sustained by the good sense and the good feeling of the majority among the parishioners. In his speech Dr. Creighton made special allusion to the diocese of London, in which some curious difficulties existed, and certain of the clergy were not prepared to accept his decision on subjects under dispute. But these were, he showed, cases in which a settlement was rendered difficult by legal obscurities and disputed points of law. This part of the Bishop's speech supplied appropriate

illustration of that great difficulty belonging to the whole controversy, the difficulty of regulating a religious organisation by the sections and sub-sections of a Parliamentary enactment.

Then came the opportunity for Lord Halifax to take his part. He opened his speech by calling the attention of the House to the composition and character of the meeting which had been held in the Albert Hall, with the object of denouncing Ritualistic practices. This meeting, he stated, was to a great extent an assemblage of Nonconformists, and he asked, with some scorn in his manner, whether the Nonconformist body might be considered a qualified tribunal to sit in judgment over the internal regulations of the Church of England. Lord Halifax pushed his argument a good deal farther still. He contended that those who held with him had ever denied, and would ever continue to deny, that it was within the competence of Parliament or the Crown, according to the traditions of the Church of England, to alter these ceremonials of the Church. He admitted that it was most painful to those who thought with him when they found themselves brought into a position which seemed like that of opposition to the Bishops, but he argued that there were occasions when the decree of the Bishop could no more be accepted than the judgment of a court of law as the final decree in some dispute as to the religious ceremonial of the English Church. The main object of the speech was to

impress on the House of Lords and on the public the deep conviction of the speaker that nothing but disaster could come from any effort to force upon the consciences of members of the Church of England the decisions of merely secular courts of law in spiritual affairs.

The Earl of Kimberley took what may be described as the appropriate Parliamentary view of the whole subject. His argument was that whatever might be thought or said of the question of State Church or no State Church, it was vain to disregard the fact that the Church of England was regulated to a large extent by the Act of Uniformity. There might, of course, be conditions in that Act of which they could not all approve, but still it was the charter under which the Church held her position—and here he came to the very heart of the question—not as a spiritual Church, but as a Church established by the law and enjoying certain emoluments. Lord Kimberley certainly brought the debate to its central point when he directed attention to that fact. It would be vain to argue that a Church established by law, and endowed by law with certain sources of emolument, can be held free to dispense with any reference to law where the conduct of its ceremonies is concerned. Lord Kimberley admitted that, subject to the principle he had brought under the notice of the Peers, he thought the Church ought to be comprehensive; but it does not seem that he even endeavoured to explain how it would be

possible to find a definition of the term comprehensive which could commend itself alike to all the ruling authorities and to all the members of the State Church.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, took an important part in the debate, as was to be expected from so distinguished and influential a representative of the Broad Church, who had expressed his opinions in published writings which at one time created a sensation throughout the whole civilised world. Dr. Temple denied that there had been any remissness on the part of the Bishops in endeavouring to maintain the true doctrines of the Church of England in Ritual and ceremonial, but he declared also that he shared with many, or most, others the belief that the fewer prosecutions they had the better, and he added the expression of his strong conviction that the amount of anything approaching to Romanism in the English Church was small and insignificant. 'I do not mean to tell the House,' Dr. Temple said, 'that there are not men who have really gone beyond the limits of the doctrine which the Church of England prescribes. I do not mean that there are not some here and there, but I am sure they are very few, and I am quite sure that in the vast majority of the cases in which the Ritual has been complained of, the clergy who indulge in these Ritual irregularities have no desire whatever to join the Church of Rome themselves or to get others to join that Church.' These words

from the Archbishop seem to have been received with general approval in the House of Lords. In so cool-headed an assembly it could hardly be a common belief that there were in the ranks of the Church of England large numbers of clergymen who, in their inner convictions, belonged to the Church of Rome, and who yet had not the truthfulness and courage to proclaim themselves accordingly, and cease to hold their places in the Church of England.

Then Dr. Temple gave it as his opinion that 'when you find that a man who is perhaps very foolishly going into all sorts of Ritual excesses is at the same time devoted to the work which is assigned to him to do, you cannot help feeling that you must exercise great delicacy and care before you interfere with such work as his. If, after all, we succeed in bringing about the obedience of the clergy generally, but there are still a few who stand out and refuse altogether to obey, you must consider carefully what step is next to be taken. I have never said, and I certainly do not mean to say, that we shall not have recourse to the courts of law; but we really ought, for the sake of the Church, for the sake of the work the Church is doing, to try every means before we take those harsh means with which the law courts supply us. I appeal to the great body of the laity of this country to support the Bishops in quietly endeavouring to set these matters right, as I assure you we really mean to do.' The Arch-

bishop of Canterbury's speech brought the debate to an end. To use the words appropriate to such an occasion, the subject was allowed to drop. No formal resolution had been proposed, and to take a division is an unusual course of action in the proceedings of the Upper Chamber. So far as the outer public could observe, the general impression among the Peers had been that the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury fairly described the position of the Bishops, and accurately set forth the difficulties which stood in the way of a strenuous course of action on the part of the Episcopal authorities. The enthusiast on either side might feel sure that he saw his way clearly; but the House of Lords is not mainly made up of enthusiasts, and shows habitually a willingness to let things go their way.

The House of Lords had, however, on this occasion one advantage over the House of Commons, where the subject of Ritualism was again to come up for discussion. The practical question at issue was whether the Bishops of the English Church had done their duty in preventing the spread of Ritualism, and whether, if they had not done their duty, there were any means of compelling them to do it. Here, then, the House of Lords had naturally the advantage over the House of Commons so far as public interest was concerned. A Bishop could get up in the House of Lords and defend himself if he were attacked, or arraign some of his ecclesiastical colleagues if he felt so

inclined. If there were to be Parliamentary condemnations, here were the men to be condemned, and here they had a chance of defending themselves in person. In the House of Commons there was for this especial question only an assembly of critics, and no matter how many Bishops might be arraigned, no Bishop could arise to defend himself. The House of Commons approached the controversy with its usual directness, at least in its opening form. Mr. Samuel Smith, who may be described as one of the leaders of the Evangelical or anti-Ritualist party, moved a resolution declaring that, 'Having regard to the lawlessness prevailing in the Church of England, some legislative steps should be taken to secure obedience to the law.' Mr. Smith contended that no improvement whatever had lately taken place in the practices of a large proportion of the clergy as the result of any charges delivered by the Bishops during the past year. The explanation of this fact, he contended, was that the breaches of the law were by no means confined to the clergy merely, but that many of the Bishops were themselves breakers of the law. He maintained that the Bishops were very commonly selected from the Ritualist ranks, and that they themselves naturally made use of their position to favour the doctrines in which they believed. According to Mr. Smith the root of the whole evil lay in the training given to candidates for Holy Orders in the theological colleges. He maintained that the manuals used in many of

these colleges inculcated the leading doctrines of the Church of Rome, and he insisted that the voluntary schools were becoming 'mere seed-plots for the spread of Romanism.' There, then, the House of Commons might be said to have the extreme case for the anti-Ritualists set plainly and squarely before it.

Mr. Smith was followed by Viscount Cranborne, who was understood to represent the principles of the High Church party, and it will easily be assumed that he did not associate himself with Mr. Smith's opinions or with Mr. Smith's manner of giving expression to them. Lord Cranborne declared that he had no sympathy with the Ritualistic practices of certain clergymen, nor could he sympathise with the attitude which some of these clergymen had taken towards their ecclesiastical superiors, but at the same time he disassociated himself emphatically from any sympathy with movements which he could not but consider as an attack upon the Church, and an attack sometimes made with weapons which he regarded as altogether unworthy. Lord Cranborne's speech was what might have been anticipated from one who did not desire to bring the ceremonials of his Church down to the bare form of Nonconformist worship, but who would not admit that there was no middle course between rigid Nonconformity and the Roman Catholic ritual. That was, indeed, the great difficulty which troubled the minds of most outer observers during the whole of the controversy.

To the ordinary observer it seemed that the greater this difficulty became the less hope could there be of settling it by any appeal to a court of law. One can imagine a visitor from some other sphere of civilisation, such a visitor as Swift might imagine and describe, studying the question from a seat in the Strangers' Gallery of the House of Lords or the House of Commons. We can imagine such a stranger listening to speakers like Lord Kimberley in the one House or Lord Cranborne in the other, and being much puzzled to understand where any hope of a settlement could be found for a purely religious question through the medium of a court of law, when among the leading men of the State, in the Parliament created to make laws, such a hopeless difference of opinion existed as to whether certain religious ceremonials were in strict conformity with law and religion or were revolting outrages against religion and law.

Meanwhile the debate in the House of Commons moved briskly on. It was much enlivened by a brilliant speech by Mr. Augustine Birrell, who, with but a short Parliamentary experience, had come to be regarded as a distinguished figure in debate. Mr. Birrell had already made his mark as an advocate in the courts of law and as the author of books, some of which, like *Obiter Dicta*, had obtained a sudden and universal popularity. There is a time-honoured understanding that we cannot all of us do all things, and therefore when Mr. Birrell became known as a candidate for a seat in

the House of Commons the general impression was that he might be destined to follow in the wake of other successful authors and legal advocates, and to make but a poor figure in Parliamentary debate. But Mr. Birrell delighted his friends, and confounded the dismal prophets by proving himself from the very beginning one of the most ready, eloquent, and attractive speakers in the representative chamber.

In his speech on Mr. Smith's amendment to the Address, Mr. Birrell promptly and decisively told the House of Commons that although a Nonconformist of the Nonconformists he found himself utterly unable to lend his support to the proposition then brought up for discussion. He refused to associate himself in any way with legislative measures designed to harry any particular class or school of thought within the Church. Then he proclaimed the principle which had long held possession of the minds of many English Liberals—the principle that the only cure for the present troubles within the Church of England was to be found in the disestablishment of that Church and its release from the control and the endowments of the State. Sir John Kennaway brought back the question to somewhat narrower limits. He argued that what the House had really to decide was whether it would give the Bishops time to do what he maintained they were desirous of doing, or would force them into action by adopting a course of legislation which might carry with it the risk

of bringing about a positive disruption of the Church of England. He reminded the House of what had happened in Scotland in 1843, and appealed to his hearers to remember the history of that time, and to beware of the consequences of precipitate legislation. When the debate on this particular amendment seemed to have gone far enough, Mr. Balfour, as leader of the House, rose to bring the discussion becomingly to a conclusion. Mr. Balfour's speech was described at the time as thoroughly judicious in its tone and satisfactory to all but the holders of extreme opinions on both sides. Indeed the ministerial orator who could have satisfied the holders of extreme opinions on both sides of that discussion must have been endowed with persuasive qualities little short of the supernatural. The tone of the speech was in harmony with Mr. Balfour's previous utterances on the various presentations of the general subject. Mr. Balfour said there was one point on which they were all thoroughly agreed, and that was that the law of the Church must be obeyed by the clergy of the Church. But then came the difficulty—how to get at the process by which that obedience could be best enforced—and here the whole trouble came up once again. Mr. Balfour does not seem to have gone very far in his effort to help the House of Commons and the general public out of this difficulty. He said that he must earnestly deprecate the adoption of any course which might have the effect of alienating in the

slightest degree the sympathies of any section of the English Church, or of diminishing the broad toleration which was a characteristic mark and a most glorious heritage of that Church. Mr. Balfour could not see that any good would come of depriving Bishops of the veto; on the contrary, he thought that if need were shown it would be the duty of the Government to strengthen the hands of the Bishops.

This was the sum and substance of the speech, and it will be seen that it did not give the House of Commons much light and leading. Mr. Balfour, no doubt, saw fully the whole difficulties of the question, but he probably saw also that no mere tinkering by legislation would be of the slightest use, and where he did not thoroughly see his way it was never his habit to impress upon the House of Commons the idea that he knew all about the matter, and would reveal his meaning fully when the proper opportunity should arise. The House of Commons showed that thus far it had not been stirred to any very deep interest, for the number of votes given were only 89 for the motion, and 221 against it. It should be mentioned that the Roman Catholics and the Nonconformists in the House refrained from taking any part in the division. There could be no doubt that a strong party was growing up throughout the country which, while in sympathy with the general movements of the anti-Ritualists, had yet in view a different solution of the difficulty from that which the anti-

Ritualists as a body were willing to contemplate. The shadow of that greater question, the proposal of the severance of the Church from the State, was already impending over the whole controversy, and making difficult the paths of those who still hoped to find their way out of the trouble by some temporary by-road of compromise.

Yet another attempt was made in the Commons in May, during the same Session, to bring about a settlement in some sort of the Church question. Mr. C. M'Arthur introduced a measure described as the Church Discipline Bill, a measure which proposed to set up a new tribunal and new systems of punishment for offences against the legalised Ritual of the Church. This measure proposed to affirm the Royal supremacy, to remove the episcopal veto, and to substitute deprivation for imprisonment in the case of clerical disobedience. The Attorney-General encountered the motion for the introduction of this Bill by an amendment declaring that while the House was not prepared to accept a measure which at once created new offences and interfered with the authority of the Bishops, it was of opinion that 'if the efforts now being made by the Archbishops and Bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and realm.' Lord Hugh Cecil then made a remarkable and characteristic speech. He carried with him the feelings of a good many

members on the ministerial side of the House when he expressed a more or less mild contempt for the amendment, and declared that the course taken by the Government was wanting alike in wisdom and in dignity. But he maintained that any legislation of the same character as the Bill just then proposed, which aimed at removing the disciplinary authority of the Bishops and giving it to a lay tribunal, if brought forward in that House, would be strenuously and uncompromisingly resisted by the majority of the members. He insisted that there was an utter incompatibility between the legislation contemplated by Mr. M'Arthur's Bill and that view of the functions of a Bishop which had commended itself to the authors of the Reformation settlement in England. Lord Hugh Cecil contended that the true remedy for the present troubles was to be found in an appeal to the authority which the whole High Church party acknowledged—the authority of the Bishops. Then he argued that the authority of the Bishops was already being exercised, with a satisfactory measure of success, against illegal practices; and he expressed his conviction that the Archbishops in the tribunal they had set up would come to a wise and an independent decision, and that, whatever their decision might be, the overwhelming mass of the High Church clergy and laity would conform to that decision without hesitation.

Here again the House had the advantage of

listening to a presentation of the case which was, at all events, something beyond a policy of mere compromise. Lord Hugh Cecil's speech had the attraction for his hearers that it suggested a hopeful view of the question, and called upon those who heard it to believe that no new legislation and no disruption of existing institutions was needed for the purpose of setting things right. As Lord Hugh Cecil was not commonly believed to be a man with a natural inclination for making things smooth, his speech had a happy effect on the majority of those who listened to it. Then Sir William Harcourt came upon the scene once again. He announced his readiness to vote for the second reading of the Bill, but at the same time he certainly did not give the measure anything like his whole-hearted approval. He admitted that the Bishops were, or ought to be more than any other power, the guardians of the law of the Church, but then came the question whether the Bishops had done all that they could have done to maintain themselves in that capacity. He declared that for himself he could not find evidence enough to enable him to answer that question in the affirmative. He admitted that the Bill before the House contained much of which he could not thoroughly approve, but he was strongly of opinion that it was necessary to remove the veto, or at least to restrict it to the repression of merely trivial and vexatious prosecutions, and if only for that reason he was

prepared to give the second reading the support of his vote.

A speech from Mr. Balfour brought the debate to a close, and it has to be observed that in this instance Mr. Balfour expressed his opinions with a less uncertain sound than on other and recent occasions. He called upon the House to reject the Bill by an overwhelming majority. He defended the Bishops from the charge of doing nothing either to sustain the law or to keep the Church in harmony, and he expressed a hope that the action of the Bishops would render any new legislation unnecessary. He contended at the same time that there must be an established court of law somewhere in the background, inasmuch as no spiritual institution could possibly flourish on continuous litigation. He said he was fully convinced 'that if time should show that the existing organisation of the Church cannot secure that obedience which exists in the body of every communion, whatever its character, and if the remedy is such as to destroy the practical episcopal character of the Church, that will be the beginning of the end of the Church of England.' Mr. Balfour, however, emphatically declared his conviction that no such results were to be anticipated; that the existing system of law as administered by the present episcopate would be found sufficing for all its purposes, and that if the Church was to remain the Church of the great body of Englishmen, it must continue to be in essence and in form the institution which

had been purified and remodelled by the Reformation. The division was then taken, and the Bill was rejected by 310 to 156 votes.

Perhaps with this division the story of the struggle may be brought to a close so far as this History is concerned. There were, of course, many other demonstrations of public feeling made on all sides of the question before the close of the reign. There were deputations to the Prime Minister, there were deputations to Archbishops, there were public meetings held in various parts of the country. There was Mr. Kensit's personally conducted crusade against Ritualistic practices in the Church, there was many a controversy in the columns of the newspapers, and new organisations were called into existence. But the controversy cannot be said to have made any advance towards a practical settlement during the reign of Queen Victoria. The anti-Ritualists were all agreed among themselves that the ceremonials of the Church of England were undergoing a 'Romanising process,' as it was called, and a large proportion of them were seriously of opinion that this process was the work of a treacherous internal conspiracy against the supremacy of the State Church and the principles of the Protestant Reformation. A large number of Nonconformists in their various denominations shared these views. But among the anti-Ritualists who belonged to the State Church there was no substantial agreement as to the course which ought to be taken

to get rid of the danger. Some believed in the efficacy of the civil law to put an end to the whole trouble, but even among this large body there was much difference of opinion as to the tribunal and as to the method of enforcing the law. These were of opinion that the veto on prosecution ought to be taken from the Bishops; those on the other hand were for having recourse to the new forms of legislation. Even among the latter, however, there was no general agreement as to what course the new legislation could most advantageously take, while there were inside the Established Church and outside many anti-Ritualists who shrank from encouraging any further interference of the legal tribunals with the action of the episcopal authorities and the Church itself. The Ritualists within the Church, it need hardly be said, maintained all through that they were carrying out to their truest expression the doctrines of the Church of England and the principles of the Reformation. There was also growing up among members of the Protestant Church, as well as among Protestants of Nonconformist denominations, the belief that the influence of the Church of England could never work its way to the hearts and the minds of the people so long as it was subservient to legislation and maintained by the funds of the State. The whole problem remained unsolved to the close of the reign, and remains still a problem for solution.

CHAPTER VIII.

‘HERE’S A WOMAN WOULD SPEAK.’

THE agitation for what are conventionally described as woman’s rights had some marked successes and emerged into a clearer atmosphere during the closing years of Queen Victoria’s reign. In previous volumes we have described the movement, partly political and partly social, for the enlargement of woman’s sphere of activity as it showed itself during the first fifty years or thereabouts of the reign. It may truly be said that the struggle for woman’s rights—that is, for woman’s right to take an equal share with man in the business of life—has been going on for as long a period as history or legend enables us to trace in the development of human life. From the days of the Amazons—whether those days be merely legendary or not—and through all succeeding ages, we have some illustration of woman’s effort to put herself on a thorough equality with man. Many of the legends telling us of these efforts are evidently stories with a satirical meaning, and were intended not to bear witness to the rightful

claims of the movement but to show the absurd and intolerable consequences which, according to the tellers of the stories, would come upon any region where this monstrous regiment of women was permitted to exist. The controversy concerning the rights of woman when it passed altogether out of the age of legend came to be known merely as the assertion by women, and by men on behalf of women, of woman's right to complete political and social emancipation. In other words, her right to be placed on an equality with man so far as the making of a living and the exercise of citizenship were concerned.

As regards equality with man in the ways of making a living, the advocates of woman's rights always accepted, in our days, certain limitations to the extension of this principle. Even in the United States, where the advocates of woman's rights were most fervid, it never was urged that women should become soldiers or sailors, nor was there any complaint made as to the exclusiveness maintained by certain classes of employers in never giving a chance to women to show themselves the equals of men as bricklayers or stonemasons. In the British Empire and in the United States the advocates of woman's rights have occupied themselves, for the most part, in the effort to have the legal and the medical professions thrown open to wives and sisters as well as to husbands and brothers; to remove from woman the disqualification which now prevents her from giving a vote at

the elections of members to the legislative body, and for a long time shut her out from the right to serve on any local governing body.

The question as to the right of women to become members of Parliament, or the desirability of giving them such a right, can hardly be said to have come up yet for practical and immediate discussion in these countries. There are indeed many able advocates of woman's rights who contend that women, if duly elected, ought to be allowed to enter the House of Commons as members of the representative chamber, and who contend also that an alteration of existing laws, in order to bring about that great change, is one of the certainties of the immediate future. Such we know was the opinion of so great a thinker as John Stuart Mill, and it would be somewhat venturesome for any observer to insist that no such change is ever likely to come about. But, as we can all see for ourselves, that particular change in our constitutional system has not given occasion to much public discussion in Great Britain and Ireland up to the present time. John Bright once gave it as a reason for not entering into public debate on some suggested reform in our governing system that the question had not yet come up, and that he could afford to wait until it should make its presence felt. The same may be said as to the argument that the House of Commons ought to be open by law to the election of women as well as of men to occupy seats

on its green benches. The question has not yet come up, and when it does then will be the fitting time to form our opinions on it.

In the meanwhile there has been effective work done in the abolition or modification of some of the laws and practices which excluded women from so many occupations, professional, political, and municipal, which were until recently open only to men. Many local boards already admit women to membership, and the Universities have done so in some instances. Measures have actually been brought into Parliament for the granting of the electoral suffrage to women who can show that they possess the household, or lodger, or other qualification which entitles men to have a vote at an election. These measures have thus far been rejected by Parliament, or at least have had to be withdrawn after a hopeless struggle. But in some of the British colonies such measures have been passed, and the legislative systems there have not, to all appearance, fallen into utter confusion, nor have the household hearths been left entirely destitute of the housewife's protective care. There does not seem any substantial reason for the idea that the statutory qualifications enabling a man to give a vote in the choice of his Parliamentary representative should not enable a woman also to give her vote for the same purpose. It might be argued that women, forming as they do the more dependent sex, have for that very reason a claim the more, and not a

claim the less, to the right of exercising some choice as to the men who are to make laws for the rule of the whole community.

If it be said that the education of the majority of women in the poorer and the working-classes does not fitly qualify them for the exercise of such a choice, it might surely be replied with great fairness, by the advocates of women's suffrage, that among the poorer and the working-classes the great majority of male voters are not always quite qualified to exercise a sound and wise judgment in the choice of the representatives who are to go into the House of Commons and govern the country. There is no education franchise known to the British Constitution, and if there were it could be applied to women as well as to men, and the exclusion of an ignorant tapster would not detract from the service of the community any more than the exclusion of an ignorant charwoman. All that our system thus far requires as qualification for a male voter is that he shall have occupied a rateable home for a certain time, and the law takes no further account whatever of his capacity to choose the right man from among the competing candidates at his local election. As the law stands at present a woman of the highest education, who has proved her capacity as a writer of books or a teacher in public institutions, is shut out from the right to give a vote at a Parliamentary election, while the man who makes her shoes, or keeps a disreputable public-house in her neighbourhood,

may help to turn by his vote the electoral scale in favour of some Parliamentary candidate whose name he had never heard a week before the election. One of the most distinguished among the women advocates of woman's rights in England declared that she could not help feeling a little humiliated by the reflection that she was unable to give a vote at a Parliamentary election, while the driver of the omnibus which passed her doors was a free and independent voter.

There are many of the opponents of woman's electoral suffrage who found their objection on the argument that the granting of a vote to women at Parliamentary elections would infallibly lead to the admission of women as members of the House of Commons. They can fairly plead that, as the number of the female population is larger than that of the male in these countries, there might be a larger proportion of qualified female voters, and that these might refuse their support to any candidate who did not profess himself willing, if elected, to support in the House of Commons a measure for the admission of women to the position of Parliamentary representatives. This is, however, an objection which might apply to any and every successive step taken for the emancipation of woman from her condition of dependency and domestic vassalage. The modern world has happily got over the idea that each successive step in political or social reform ought to be resisted, on the ground that it may open the way for complete political or social anarchy.

We have heard that argument used in opposition to so many measures of reform which afterwards proved themselves absolutely beneficial that we can hardly be expected to pay much attention to its anticipated repetition. It may be taken for granted that if the movement for the emancipation of woman from feudal disqualifications becomes strong enough to make her claim for a political vote a formidable element in our political controversies, it is not likely to be reduced to silent impotence by the alarmist prediction that to give women the electoral qualification can only end in giving women the right to become members of Parliament. No great step of reform will be taken in this steady-going country without a good deal of deliberation, and even when women do obtain, as they probably will sooner or later, the right to vote at Parliamentary elections on the same conditions as those which now attach to the voting of men, there will still be time to consider the expediency of allowing women to sit in the British Parliament, and no Mænad revolution will drive us into this Constitutional change.

During the later years of Queen Victoria's reign, not much was heard of the agitation in favour of giving women the electoral suffrage, and very little about the expediency of opening the doors of the House of Commons for the admission of women as members. During those later years with which we are now concerned the

advocates of woman's rights were engaged for the most part in endeavouring to establish for women their right to enter the professions of law and medicine, and to bear a part in the administration of municipal, parochial, and other local governing bodies. So far as the medical profession is concerned, it seems hard to understand what the principle is which would fain insist that no woman must take any part in its business of prescribing, consulting, and operating. All the other functions of the medical and surgical professions except these alone have been shared by women so far as history or legend can inform us of the doings of the human race. Women in our own days are hospital nurses, are allowed, authorised, and encouraged to attend to the wounded on the battle-field; and it need hardly be said that on the battle-field they have frequently to act on their own motion altogether, and to start some healing process without waiting for the prescription of a qualified medical man. Even among the most ordinary experiences of a hospital, or in the sick rooms of private patients, it often happens that the manner in which the nurse performs her duties is of far more critical importance to the sufferer than the prescription which the qualified physician has written out. The disease from which the patient is suffering, even though it carry mortal danger with it, may yet be one for which the treatment to be prescribed is simple and obvious, and the ultimate rescue of the patient may wholly

depend on the manner in which the advice of the physician is carried out by the nurse. It seems to pass the wit of mortal to suggest any possible harm that could be done to the cause of good order and the rights of man by allowing a woman to prescribe a means of cure as well as to put the means of cure into practical operation. The examining body in whose hands is placed the duty of deciding whether a man is qualified to become physician, surgeon, or apothecary, would no doubt be capable also of deciding whether any woman who presented herself with a similar request was equally qualified to exercise such functions.

The same may be said concerning the highly qualified bodies to whom the task is entrusted of deciding whether and when the young law students who apply for admission to the bar are fit for the duties on which they claim a right to enter. If these learned bodies can decide as to the fitness of the male candidate, they may be trusted not to go wrong when asked to pronounce as to the fitness of the female candidate. So, too, of the various distinctions that universities and colleges and other public bodies of different kinds are in the habit of conferring on men, and have yet, for the most part, denied to women. It can hardly be supposed that there now lingers anywhere in the civilised human mind a serious dread lest all society should be disturbed, the family relations thrown into confusion, and the old order changed

suddenly into something entirely new if we were to allow women to prescribe medicines, cross-examine witnesses at the bar, and accept honorary degrees from learned or other public bodies. During the closing years of the late reign there were already ample evidences that the legal barriers drawn between men and women on what might seem to be a common field were being gradually removed. In the meantime, women in almost all civilised countries were making it clearly apparent that they were capable of founding organisations for the accomplishment of their common purposes, which could equal in numbers, cohesion, perseverance, and popular effect any combined movements undertaken by combinations of men. One of the most favourite and familiar jests of elder days used to be, in some form or other, the suggestion that no number of women, whether the number were large or small, could continue to act together for any reasonable length of time without breaking off into cureless quarrel. The evidences of fact have, at all events, got rid of that idea, and we have seen immense organisations of women working out their steady course from year to year without any perceptible evidences of disunion. There have, no doubt, been disputes now and then in this or that association got up by women to carry out some common purpose, but it has probably been observed that from time to time some of the organisations constituted by men and for men have become disturbed by internal

disputes, and have sometimes even broken up in utter confusion.

It is certain that the large associations formed by women for the accomplishment of the reforms which they hold in view have been worked with as much steadfastness and harmonious action as any organisations that law-making man himself has called into existence. Many of the societies organised and officered by women for the accomplishment of various reforms in woman's social position have been presided over by women of the highest rank and influence, and have enrolled among their numbers women of even the poorest class. An International Congress of Women was opened at Westminster in the June of 1889, and was presided over by Lady Aberdeen, who has rendered great service in such movements. The Congress was said to have represented some twenty-eight different countries, and had nearly one million and a half of enrolled members. Queen Victoria received a delegation of 150 members from this Congress at Windsor Castle. Women's Temperance Associations were formed all over the civilised world, not with the object of working out the temperance cause in any form of antagonism to that which had been so long adopted by earnest and active men, but in order to arouse by direct appeal the sympathies and the co-operation of women, and to put them in the way of spreading the cause of temperance among their own sisterhood and among the members of their own

families in a manner which would not have been so readily accessible to men. One great object for all who believed in what is understood as the emancipation of women was accomplished by the remarkable success of those various institutions. It was made distinctly evident to the world in general that the women of all civilised States believed themselves to have a common cause in view, and that they were as capable of disciplining themselves for the steady and regular work of reform as any organisation of men could possibly be. When the agitation had got so far as to make this fact evident, it might be said without extravagance of assertion that the true cause of woman's rights was already on the eve of complete success.

The first work of such a movement was to impress on the great majority of ordinary observers, women as well as men, that woman was then by the laws and customs of almost all civilised States excluded from a share in work physical or intellectual in which she was perfectly qualified to bear a part, and excluded also from even competing for distinctions and honours which she could prove herself capable of winning if only she were not rigidly shut out from the chance of competition. When that first step in the movement had been effectively taken, the next object to be attained was to impress on the general public everywhere the conviction that women could act together for great purposes of reform as harmoniously and

perseveringly as any body of men. The steady co-operation of women in their special movements of reform during these later years has satisfied all rational observers on this subject also.

The whole question as to the concession of woman's rights is coming up now in a form the reverse of that which it bore during the earlier discussion. When women first asked that certain reforms in law and practice ought to be made on their behalf, the question propounded by the amazed and bewildered world was—'Why?' At this stage of the movement, when the yielding of women's claim comes up for consideration, the question put is, 'Why not?' In other words, the feeling of cool-headed and impartial observers at the present time is not any longer an impulse to reject the whole claim at once, but rather to ask how much of the claim ought any longer to be resisted—Why should not the whole claim be granted? Let us come to an understanding as to the extent of emancipation to which the women are fairly entitled. When any long agitated question of reform has got to this stage of development, it may be assumed that the settlement of the question is henceforward to be a matter of compromise, or rather, perhaps, of a series of compromises at successive steps in the advance of the movement.

The time has gone when the agitation for woman's rights created a sort of panic in the hearts not only of most men but also of many women.

The season of the scare has passed in dissonance out of sight. Nobody now believes that if we allow these women to go their own way any longer we shall soon hear them insisting on being enlisted as soldiers in the army or taken on board as sailors in the navy. Nor is it seriously believed that if the legal profession be opened to women under any conditions we shall before long find the judicial bench occupied by the fair sex to the utter exclusion of poor humiliated man. The whole conditions of life, it is now admitted, and of modern civilisation, are not likely to undergo a process of such complete transformation as to leave women without those more congenial and long familiar occupations as wives and mothers which must to some extent interfere with their ambition to distinguish themselves in cavalry regiments or on the bench of justice, and would leave them without the spare time in which to qualify themselves for such opportunities of distinction. In the same spirit we are all beginning to regard the movement for the admission of women to the privilege of dropping a vote into a ballot-box at a Parliamentary election. Even the more old-fashioned among men might now regard this proposition also as one which does not carry with it any elements of portentous alarm. If the growing education of women, and especially their education in the practical affairs of public and social life, should create in them an ambition to accept their share of the duties of

citizenship, it may be assumed that such an ambition serves toward its own justification, and is a tendency among rational creatures which could hardly be dangerous to the well-being of society.

Men not yet old can remember a time when it was regarded as necessary to the preservation of a prosperous and peaceful State that the operative classes in general, male as well as female, should be excluded from any vote in the choice of their Parliamentary representatives. Yet in so conservative a country as England we have seen the voting qualification so far extended as to admit what may be described as household suffrage on the very lowest scale, and it does not seem as if we have thereby brought ourselves any nearer to the verge of anarchy. There are still but few working-men in the House of Commons, and those who are there have been elected because of the practical and distinguished services they had rendered to their own order. It does not follow as a matter of course that if all duly qualified women were to be endowed by law with the Parliamentary franchise they must necessarily set their hearts on nothing but the election of women as representatives. The question, however, as to the admission of women to Parliament is not on the horizon just yet, and we may at least cheer ourselves with the assurance that if such a change should be brought about it will only be after the whole subject shall have received due consideration, and the average mind of the British Empire

shall have set itself to contemplate, without alarm, the prospect of a change which would allow a woman to sit and vote in the House of Commons, and to have the letters M.P. added to her family name.

The fact to which we invite attention now is that the woman's movement is no longer regarded by the general public with any feeling of alarm, and that its further development will be followed with the same kind of interest, the same order of controversy, the same encouragement from the optimist, the same disparaging criticism from the pessimist which attend every agitation for political or social reform. We have all grown familiar with the fact that women do form associations of their own, conduct organisations of their own for the carrying of some scheme of reform; that they succeed with this measure, and have to postpone that other, and that in the meantime the ordinary business of life goes on much as it did before. Now that we have all become accustomed, women as well as men, to the idea that women are members of municipal and parochial boards, that their full admission to the legal and medical profession and to university degrees is only a matter of time, we can understand that they may come, without our special wonder, to have the right to vote at Parliamentary elections, and even perhaps to sit, if elected, as Parliamentary representatives.

This significant change in public feeling has

been almost entirely brought about during Queen Victoria's later years of reign. The movement has long since passed entirely out of the comic stage, and the fact that a woman happens to be a member of some local board or council does not now put laughter to any trouble as to the holding of both his sides. It may be observed that the comic element in the whole movement began to disappear as the agitation for woman's rights repudiated more and more the association of woman's rights with the right to clothe herself in the conventional garments of man. All the many associations got up and kept in motion for promoting women's claims are now regarded by society merely as society regards similar associations formed amongst men. Each is judged of according to its own aims, its own discipline, and its own results; and the day has entirely passed away when the fact that a large number of women become banded together in every community for the accomplishment of legislative reforms in society's dealings with women could be regarded as something to laugh at, something to be dreaded, or something to be morally condemned. The whole movement in favour of woman's rights as our modern world has seen it forms part of the history of Queen Victoria's reign. It began with the opening of that period, and the close of that period saw it expanded and improved, in every sense, recognised fully by public opinion, approved, sustained, and officered by women of the highest education and the greatest social influence,

and to all appearance in a fair way towards the accomplishment of every success which it is justly entitled to win.

Our survey of woman's intellectual activity at this period gives an appropriate opportunity for recording the death of a woman who, although not prominently associated with political organisation of any kind, will ever hold a place in history because of the services which she rendered to education, to scholarship, and to literature. Miss Anna Swanwick died November 2, 1899, aged 86. Miss Swanwick came of a Liverpool Nonconformist family, and after having had much good education in England went to Berlin to continue there the studies for which she felt a special inclination. She devoted herself very closely to German, Greek, and Hebrew, and then returned to England and lived with her family in London. There she added to her accomplishments by becoming a close student of the higher mathematics. Her especial desire seems always to have been the introduction to England of some of the great masters of German literature. She published in 1843 a volume of translated selections from the plays of Goethe and Schiller, which she followed up a few years after by a complete translation of Schiller's 'Maid of Orleans.' These books procured for her almost immediately a distinct reputation. The English mind was then only beginning to experience the influence of German literature, that influence which Thomas Carlyle had been helping to spread

with such magical effect. Carlyle had already opened the way for the success of such efforts as those to which Anna Swanwick was now devoting herself, and she received every encouragement from the public to continue her translations of German literature. In 1850 she gave to the world her translation of the first part of 'Faust,' with renderings also of Goethe's 'Tasso,' 'Egmont,' and 'Iphigenia.' Only in 1878 did she publish her translation of the second part of 'Faust.' At that period in her literary history it was still thought possible to understand and appreciate Goethe's masterpiece by reading its first part only. It did not seem, then, to occur even to some highly educated reader that in order to understand and render full justice to the marvellous dramatic poem it must be studied as a whole, taken for all in all, and not disposed of by the reading of what we may call its opening chapters. Goethe's 'Faust,' however it may be divided in separate parts, is a continuous story, the last scene of which is indissolubly connected with the first. The bargain which is made by Faust with Mephistopheles in the opening scenes is only carried into execution, or threatened with execution, at the very end, and then comes the heavenly redemption through the intervention of the 'eternal-feminine' influence. For a long time most of our English readers appear to have been under the impression that when they read the first part of 'Faust' they had made themselves masters of

Goethe's immortal drama. One might as well have read the tragedy of 'Macbeth' just up to the point when Macbeth obtains the crown and then laid the drama aside in the contented belief that he had put himself in possession of all that Shakespeare desired to tell him.

Miss Swanwick established her reputation and popularity among readers by her first part of 'Faust,' and we are afraid that the second part, although rendered with equal accuracy and literary skill, did not obtain any fresh expansion for that popularity among the general public of the time. The two parts of 'Faust' together appeared with Retzsch's illustrations, and these no doubt may have tempted many an unenterprising reader to follow the tragedy to its end. The book in fact went into another edition during the following year. Miss Swanwick afterwards was prevailed upon by Baron Bunsen, the famous Prussian author, scholar, and diplomatist, to venture on translations from the great Greek dramatists, and she gave to the world her rendering of the dramas of *Æschylus*, which were published with Flaxman's illustrations and passed through four editions.

Miss Swanwick worked hard during her maturer years with the object of promoting the education of women. She was one of the most active in the organisation of ladies' colleges and schools of various kinds for the teaching of girls. She did not confine her exertions to the spread of education among the members of her own sex, but she also

took an active and steady part in the formation and the superintendence of classes arranged for the instruction of young working-men. Miss Swanwick not only held a high place in the literature of her time, but hers was a figure which may be called characteristic of the Victorian Age and its womanhood; for the peculiarity of that womanhood is to be found in the tendency among intellectual and gifted women not to limit themselves merely to the cultivation of literature and the development of their own gifts, but to give themselves also to the practical work of spreading education among the poor. Every age has brought forth women who became poets, painters, romancists, essayists, translators. Women, too, in every age have honourably devoted themselves to the work of diffusing education among the poor, the lowly and neglected classes. But only in our modern days have we seen women who could produce books worthy of publication and rewarded by success not content to give up all their time to the culture of their own muse, if we may so put it, but also resolute in finding time for the teaching of those who might otherwise have remained untaught. The literary woman of this order is characteristic of the Victorian Age, and in this order Miss Swanwick holds an honoured place.

The death of another distinguished woman has also, and in more than one sense, a peculiar appropriateness to this chapter of our History. Miss Mary H. Kingsley, explorer, lecturer, writer of

books, and worker in charitable missions, died on June 3, 1900, of fever at Simonstown, South Africa. She had gone out to the seat of war, and it was while nursing Boer prisoners that she met her early death. It was an early death although she might seem to have lived many lives, for she had seen but thirty-seven years when her career of unresting beneficence came to its close. Miss Kingsley was the niece of Charles Kingsley, who stamped his name so deeply on the literature and the controversy of the Victorian Age. Mary Kingsley appears to have been filled in her earlier years with a passion for travel and a love for the study of natural history. She wandered through African regions where it would seem that no European had ever travelled before, gathering specimens of plants and fossils and other such treasures especially dear to her, encountering with a cheerful heart almost unceasing dangers, her life being more than once placed in extremest peril. She gave to the world accounts of her travels, one published in 1896 called 'Travels in West Africa,' and another, 'West African Studies,' in 1898. When the war in South Africa broke out she believed that she could do good work in ministering to the wounded, and there she gave up in the noblest way a noble life. Miss Kingsley's family gave to the history of our times very distinguished names, and hers will assuredly hold its place with those of her kindred in fame.

CHAPTER IX.

THE OLD WORLD AND THE NEW.

THE attention of the world became suddenly aroused by the outbreak of a new, and at the time an unexpected international quarrel. The rival Powers concerned in this dispute were Spain and the United States—the typical Old World and the typical New World. When it is said that the outbreak of this struggle was at the time unexpected, it has to be said also that for many years it had been growing more and more evident to thinking minds that the contact into which the old European Monarchy and the new American Republic were brought by Spain's dealings with her West Indian possessions could not continue much longer without some complete change in its conditions. Spain was exercising a system of old-world absolute and tyrannical domination over Cuba and her other West Indian possessions within sight of shores which are a part of the United States. Cuba and the Philippine Islands were in a constant state of revolt against the rule of Spain, and the sympathies of a large proportion of the

American population went with the subjected islanders and against the Spanish rulers. The United States had always professed a deep interest in the condition of all the countries belonging to the New World, and professed not merely an interest in their welfare but at least a moral right to exercise some influence on their behalf. It could hardly be contended that the Monroe doctrine was to be cited as strictly bearing on the question at issue between the United States and Spain, for the Monroe doctrine was understood to apply only to new Governments set up by European Powers in either of the American Continents. The rule of Spain over Cuba could not be regarded as standing on quite the same footing as the rule that Louis Napoleon endeavoured to set up over Mexico and against which the Government of the United States issued the protest which proved fatal to the enterprise.

Cuba had been for a long time a subject of rival claims, and rival attempts amongst European Powers to get possession of the island and expel the Spaniards from it. For generations it had remained in the possession of Spain, but the Spanish domination was unceasingly resisted by native insurrections, and these insurrections found many sympathisers among the populations of the Southern States of America. The Lone Star expedition was the most celebrated among the modern attempts made to free the island from the yoke of Spain. The Lone Star was a secret society formed

in 1848, an era of revolution all over the world, for the annexation of Cuba and other islands to the United States. The organisation was got up chiefly in Alabama and some neighbouring states of the Union, and it issued a somewhat magniloquent proclamation announcing that its object was 'The extension of the institutions, power, influence, and commerce of the United States over the whole of the western hemisphere and the islands of the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean.' Cuba was to be the first acquisition of this kind, and others were to follow in due order. The President of the United States not only refused to give any countenance to this project, but he issued a proclamation denouncing the object of the invaders as a breach of international law, and calling upon all loyal American citizens to use their best influence for the prevention of the scheme. The expedition made its attempt, nevertheless; under the command of General Lopez, whose name became famous at the time, it effected a landing on the shore of Cuba. It was defeated by the Spanish troops, but Lopez and most of his comrades were enabled to escape. After little more than a twelve-months' pause a second expedition was planned by the same leader, and it too succeeded in effecting a landing on Cuba. The second attempt was a more complete failure even than the first. Lopez was defeated, and he himself, with a large number of his followers, became captives in the hands of the Spaniards. Lopez was

put to death by the garotte, and some fifty of his followers were shot.

This defeat, and the sentences which followed it, did not have the slightest effect in preventing further outbreak of revolution, or the enterprises of invading expeditions. Almost immediately after the execution of Lopez some projects were started for an attempt to free the island from Spanish rule. Before three years had passed the President of the United States had received information that a very large expedition was in course of preparation, and that many American sympathisers were giving it their countenance and their help. Once again a proclamation was issued from Washington, in the name of the President, to warn all loyal American citizens that they must not join in warlike measures against a Government with which the United States was at peace. Then another step was taken by the Washington Government. Three United States envoys were sent to Europe to look into the whole question raised by the unceasing insurrections in Cuba against Spanish dominion, and to report as to the possibility of coming to some agreement with Spain by which peace might be restored. The American envoys made a very practical, and, what might be, under certain conditions, a very reasonable and promising recommendation. The plan they proposed for the restoration of peace in Cuba was simply that the United States should buy the island from Spain and govern it as a part of the

American Republic. But here again the New World came into direct antagonism with the traditions of the Old. The pride of ancient Castile revolted against this proposal for a transaction of purchase and sale as resolutely as Cuba revolted against the Spanish dominion. The Spanish Prime Minister declared in the Cortes that the sale of Cuba to the United States would be the sale of Spanish honour.

Then the history of Cuba continued to repeat itself in the usual way. There were almost incessant insurrections—it would indeed be more correct to say that the island was in a state of continual insurrection. The efforts of the Spanish authorities to repress those insurrections were marked by ever-increasing and equally unavailing severity. Orders were given that no quarter should be shown to any rebels taken in arms, and these orders were carried out with unrelenting literalness. The longer this struggle went on the more severe became the Spanish measures of repression, and the more determined was the spirit of resistance among the Cuban population and the larger the number of American sympathisers. Apart from all feelings of humanity and common brotherhood, and apart from all American sympathies with populations rightly struggling to be free, it was every day becoming more difficult for the Government of the United States to maintain an attitude of neutrality between the Cuban insurgents and the Sovereign of Spain. Cuba had become to the United States

very much the same sort of trouble that Crete had been for a long time to Christian Europe. As Crete might be said to be within sight of southern shores of the European Continent, so Cuba was within sight of some southern shores of the American Republic. The horrors perpetrated day after day in Cuba were creating a storm of passionate indignation throughout some of the American States, and throughout the whole of those States there was a sincere and warm sympathy with the suffering Cubans, and an earnest desire to help them. There were many deeds done by the Cubans in arms which could not be justified by any rules of military warfare, but it would have been idle to expect that, where remorseless and savage measures of repression were in daily use by the constituted authorities, there could be invariable respect for the laws of humanity showed by the resisting Cubans.

It must have been evident to the eyes of all observers that the Cubans would never submit to Spanish rule so long as there remained any Cubans to carry on the struggle. It was equally evident that the United States could never consent to have that terrible trouble going on so near to their own shores without taking decided steps sooner or later towards bringing it to an end. We can understand the full nature of the daily difficulty imposed upon the American Republic if we form to ourselves a picture of what English feeling might be under similar conditions. Let us sup-

pose that the Channel Islands were held to-day under the Government of some foreign State detested by the populations of those islands. Let us suppose that the foreign State—assume it to be Spain for the sake of the illustration—was perpetually engaged in endeavouring to crush out the risings of the Channel Island people against their tyrannical masters. Let us suppose that the English newspapers were filled every day with shocking and sickening accounts of the slaughter carried on by well-armed Spanish troops among the brave and indomitable but badly armed islanders; that in the meantime there were constant expeditions going on in which English sympathisers were shedding their blood in repeated efforts to rescue the islanders, and that the feeling caused by these events began to grow so strong in England as to make the general public of this country eager for some national effort to bring the whole struggle to a close. Suppose that the English Government again and again made strong remonstrances with Spain as to her treatment of the islanders, and that these remonstrances produced no effect whatever; that England at last professed her willingness to buy the Channel Islands out and out from Spain, and to make them part of the dominions of Queen Victoria, and that this offer were rejected promptly and disdainfully by the Government of Spain. Is it to be expected that the English Government could long restrain itself from adopting a policy

which must lead to open war between England and Spain?

Such was the position into which the Government of the United States found themselves drawn more directly with each succeeding day. The President saw at last that it would be impossible for him to hold back much longer from intervention of some kind in order to put a stop to the horrible events which were making Cuba a world's wonder. It was therefore made known to Spain that if terms of arrangement could not be arrived at which might hold out a secure promise of peace and good government to the population of Cuba, the United States must take decisive action. It was thought at the time by some of the European Governments that the United States had been too peremptory in their demand, and that by quieter and more persuasive methods they might have prevailed upon Spain to listen to the voice of reason and justice. But outside the diplomatic circles the general feeling in many of the European countries was that Spain never would give in unless compelled by sheer force of arms. Spain, to do her justice, had not even in her declining days been wanting in the courage never to submit or yield, and whatever might be her national defects there was no reason to suppose that she had fallen away from the physical courage of the days when she was one of the world's great empires.

Some of the European States now felt called

upon to make overtures of their own for the purpose of obtaining a satisfactory settlement between the United States and Spain. These overtures seem to have begun with Germany, which was then becoming an active influence in the world's political movements, and the German idea was that the great States of Europe should join in a representation to the Government of Washington on behalf of Spain's right to govern her own territories without the armed intervention of a foreign Power, no matter how the sympathies of that foreign Power might go with the people of Cuba. This movement on the part of Germany was understood to have received the acquiescence and the support of France and Austria, but the project came to an end because the English Government refused to take any part in co-operation with it. Germany was probably under the impression that as there had been many misunderstandings of late years between England and the United States, England would be found quite ready to co-operate in any movement tending to prevent the United States from enlarging their territory, and strengthening their influence, even by the rescue of the Cubans from sheer tyranny. Mr. Arthur Balfour, who was at the moment conducting the business of the Foreign Office in the absence of Lord Salisbury, met the German proposal with statesmanlike judgment and resolve. He caused it to be notified to the Government at Washington that England would not at this crisis adopt any policy which

could be regarded as unfriendly to the United States. Germany appears to have made from the first the co-operation of England a condition essential to the international movement which she suggested, and therefore Mr. Balfour's action brought the whole scheme to an end.

The course taken by Mr. Balfour on behalf of the Conservative Government not only maintained the national credit and honour of England with regard to the great question involved in the Spanish oppression of Cuba, but in all probability prevented the growth of European complications which might have divided the European States into friends of Spain and friends of America, and led to international war. There was also to be considered by English statesmen the peculiar difficulty which might arise for England if she were to be led into a position which could not but be regarded as unfriendly to the United States. Across the border-line of the great American Republic lay the British Dominion of Canada, which, in the event of a quarrel with Great Britain, might be chosen by the United States as an advantageous battle-ground, and it could not be certain how far the sympathies of the Canadians might not, in such an unhappy event, go with their neighbours on the American Continent. The decision taken by Mr. Balfour cleared the air of all such apprehensions, and left the United States and Spain to decide the issue for themselves.

Popular feeling in Spain was immensely aroused

by what seemed to Spaniards the aggressive and unjustifiable attitude of the United States. The Spanish people showed a temper which might have suited rather the far-off days of Spain as a great Power than the modern days of Spain's decay. The United States had not for a long time been engaged in any warlike undertaking of an important character outside the limits of the American Continent, and there was a general impression in Europe that the Republic had not army or fleet adequate to the successful carrying on of a war with a foreign Power. Even in England, which was better acquainted than most other European States with the capacities of the American Republic for rising to the height of such a contest, there was a very common impression that Spain would be able to hold her own, or even to outdo her opponent, if the dispute should come to be a case of war. So the diplomatic interchange of ideas between the United States and Spain daily assumed a sharper tone. Some friendly suggestions were made as to the possibility of submitting the whole dispute to the arbitration of an impartial tribunal appointed for the purpose by the European Powers, but these suggestions were met by the Spanish Prime Minister with a public declaration that no such arrangement had been offered or could possibly be accepted by Spain. This announcement appears to have been received with a general chorus of approval from the Spanish Cortes and the Spanish people. Then, too, Spanish diplomacy began to charge the United

States Government with having supplied and continuing to supply weapons and munitions of war to the Cuban insurgents, and the whole dispute drifted from bad to worse.

Even if there had been any hope of the prevention of war by the diplomatic intervention of other States, an event had already occurred which must have made the maintenance of peace almost impossible. In the middle of February 1898 a cruiser of the United States, the *Maine*, lying in the harbour of Havannah, was burnt and sunk by an explosion, and 2 officers and 270 men were killed. The American Consul at Havannah made a report to his Government in which he emphatically declared his conviction that the ship was destroyed by a submarine mine which must have been laid in the harbour by, or at least with the connivance of, the Spanish authorities there, for the deliberate purpose of destroying a war-vessel belonging to a Republic which was soon to be the open enemy of Spain. The local Spanish authorities, it is only fair to say, protested strongly against the imputation. A court of inquiry was held, which found that there was no evidence to maintain the charge brought against the Spanish authorities, and ascribed the explosion to an accidental cause. The President of the United States did his best to obtain a full and impartial hearing for the case made on the part of the Spanish authorities, and for the calm consideration of the evidence presented to the commission of inquiry.

But the effect on public opinion in America was instantaneous and immense. It was a common belief in the States that the explosion had been the work of Spanish treachery, and that the endeavour to ascribe it to mere accident was but part of the usual moderating craft of diplomacy. On the other hand, even the very careful and temperate terms of President M'Kinley's message to Congress were bitterly resented because he had stated that, according to the report of the inquiry held by the American Consul and American naval officers at Havannah, the explosion was caused by a mine under the water and not by an accident happening in the vessel itself. This description of the event was taken by Spanish public opinion as a direct assertion that the submarine mine was set there by the Spanish authorities with the deliberate intention of blowing up the American warship, and thus the President's very moderate statement of the question was accepted by Spain as an additional reason for warlike preparation.

None of the proposals made by the Government of the United States could any longer receive a hearing in the excited condition of feeling in Spain, and no efforts made by European Powers, and even by the Pope himself, whose influence might be expected to count for something in Spain, could induce the Spaniards to accept anything in the form of mediation. At last President M'Kinley announced to Congress that the United States Government must declare war against Spain, and

this announcement was received with tumultuous popular rejoicings in Madrid. Spain was at that time in a very poor condition to carry on a war, and was distracted moreover by a formidable Carlist movement, which strove to restore by force the old dynasty. But the Spanish Government nevertheless went into the war, if not with a light heart, at least with an unflinching spirit. It is to be noted as an interesting and curious fact that a considerable portion of the English public believed, even after the outbreak of war, that Spain would be able to show a front of unconquerable resistance to her American opponent. But the war had hardly well begun before it was practically done. The Spanish fleets proved wholly incapable of coping with the war-vessels of the United States. The war-array of Spain in the harbours of Havannah came to speedy destruction; towns were taken by the Americans, and Europe had hardly time to study the fortunes of the war before it became known that the war was all over. The United States Government would accept no conditions of peace which did not include the absolute surrender, not only of Cuba, but also of the Philippine Islands, to the power of the conqueror. Cuba and the Philippine Islands therefore became part of the dominion of the United States, and the first step was taken in that movement of Imperialism, to adopt the English phrase, which was a novelty in the progress of the American Republic.

The treaty of peace between the United States and Spain was signed at Paris, and it need hardly be said that the Cuban population enjoyed from the first the immense advantage of having been made a part of the great Republic which, since it was fortunate enough, at immense cost to itself in life and money, to get rid of the detestable system of slavery, allows no servile condition to be imposed on any of those who people her territory. The story of the war between the United States and Spain, and the new chapter of Republican freedom which it opened up in human history, belong naturally and rightly to this narrative of the events which came to pass in the later years of Queen Victoria's reign. The whole controversy and its final settlement by war aroused at the time the deepest interest in England, and, as we have already shown, the policy adopted by the English Government helped in no slight degree to bring about what must be regarded as a satisfactory settlement of the dispute. If England could have been induced to join in the proposed coalition to give moral support, if nothing more, to the Spanish Government, the world might have seen disastrous international disturbance and the temporary maintenance of Spain's tyrannical power over her possessions on the other side of the Atlantic.

There was something curiously picturesque in this sudden antagonism between one of the oldest and greatest Imperial Powers of the Old World

and this youngest of all the great Republics that Old World or New had ever seen. It was impossible at the time not to admit a feeling of pity for the utter humiliation of that Spain which had played for many centuries so great a part in the history of conquest, and so much more noble a part in the history of arts and letters. But the most partial admirer of Spain's past could not refuse to admit that Spain had brought this late humiliation entirely upon herself, and that the cause of freedom and humanity had gained by the triumph of the American Republic. We have already described the victory won by the United States as the first step taken in an Imperialistic movement, and there were many commentators at the time in England and on the European Continent, who seemed to have made up their minds that once the American Government had gone in for conquest of foreign territory the thirst for extended dominion must grow with the first success, and that the United States would have their Imperialist parties as well as the States of the Old World. It may be acknowledged by the most friendly observers that some American statesmen have lately shown indications of a tendency towards the promotion of a spirit of Imperialism in American politics. But the whole principle and the whole heart of the American Republic are governed by a very different policy, and the United States are certainly broad enough in dominion already to feel little temptation towards the acquisition of new territories. Meanwhile Cuba

has been put in the fair way for self-government, and her future is practically in her own hands. With the populations of the Philippine Islands the American Presidents and Congresses may yet have some trouble, but it can be assumed with perfect confidence that no American statesman, whatever his tincture of Imperialistic spirit, will ever think of governing the Philippine Islands on any other than truly Republican principles.

CHAPTER X.

SOME DEATHS IN 1897.

FROM the Diamond Jubilee to the close of Queen Victoria's reign is but a short time, and yet the death-roll of its remarkable figures must be regarded by all observers as long beyond ordinary proportion or calculation. One explanation which will naturally occur to every reader is to be found in the fact that many of the distinguished men and women who passed out of life during these closing years of the reign had risen to high eminence while the reign was only yet in its earlier years, and might therefore be looked upon as having accomplished their due term of life before Queen Victoria had yet ceased to be Sovereign of these realms. But, on the other hand, it will be found as we go through the list of these deaths that many of the eminent men and women who died while Victoria was still alive had enjoyed a comparatively short—in some instances a distinctly short—career of life. The death-roll does not bear on its record merely the names of those who belonged to the British Empire, but includes

also the names of others who, though belonging to foreign countries, have become so much associated with the history of England as to make it unreasonable not to include their names in the story of Queen Victoria's reign. For the most part, however, the obituary pages of this volume will be occupied with a comparatively brief record of the successes accomplished by men and women who belonged to the British Empire in war and politics, in art and letters, in science and teaching, and in all other great and good work.

The first loss we have to record was a loss to literature. Mrs. Margaret Oliphant was one of the most successful, prolific, and popular novel-writers of her time. Mrs. Oliphant had been left a widow with three children while she was still comparatively young, and she was compelled to turn to work of some kind to make a living for herself and her family. She tried her hand for a time at painting, as many clever men and women have done who feel in themselves a capacity for artistic work of some order, but have not yet ascertained the region of art which their natural gifts call upon them to enter. Before long her native tendency expressed itself more clearly; she tried her skill as a writer, and won success almost with her first literary attempt. She wrote short stories, which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and she became from that time a regular contributor to that most popular periodical. As a novelist she soon won a distinct reputation, and it is not too

much to say that her best works of fiction hold a place only short of the highest in the literature of her time. The 'Chronicles of Carlingford' won for her a popularity which outlives her and is likely long to last. She wrote many historical and biographical works, and was indeed a remarkably versatile as well as prolific author; but she will assuredly be best remembered by her most successful works of fiction. She died on June 25, in her home at Wimbledon; and it is an interesting fact that one of her last published writings was an article on the year of Jubilee containing a lyrical poem of congratulation to the Sovereign and the people on the celebration of Queen Victoria's sixtieth anniversary as Sovereign of these realms.

Another distinguished woman whose mortal career came to an end in the same year was Jean Ingelow, who, as poetess and novelist, had achieved a high literary position and full popularity at a time when the issue of novels and poems was growing larger and larger with each succeeding year, and when to secure a place above the level of the ordinary run of authors and authoresses might entitle a man or woman to an enduring record in the country's literature. The charm of Jean Ingelow's writings was felt and acknowledged by many to whom the mere passing success of a clever pen-man or pen-woman would have counted for little or nothing. She is well entitled to her place in literary history.

Political life in England lost in this year some men who had won deserved reputation in Parliament. One of these was Anthony John Mundella, who died on July 21. Although of foreign extraction, he had thoroughly identified himself with the interests of the English people, among whom his family had long been settled. Mundella was a strong Liberal in politics, and had taken an active part in many movements for the extension of the suffrage and for the spread of education. In 1892 he held office under the Liberal Government as President of the Board of Trade, and had indeed held the same office in 1886, or other office in an earlier Liberal Government.

Another man of mark was Sir John Osborne Morgan, who, after winning in his youth many honours at Oxford, was called to the bar, afterwards became Queen's Counsel, and had for many years an extensive practice in Chancery suits. He entered Parliament as a representative of a Welsh county, became Judge Advocate-General, and afterwards Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. During his Parliamentary career, whether in office or out of office, he lent most effective aid in the carrying of several important measures of reform, one of these being the Act for the abolition of corporal punishment in the army. He was the author of a work on Chancery practice, which won a great success, and was accepted by the legal profession as a standard and authoritative work on the subject. No man during his years of Parliamentary life was better known or

more esteemed by his colleagues in the House of Commons. He died on August 25.

Richard Holt Hutton, who died on September the 9th, was one of those gifted men who might be described as an influence rather than as an individuality. He was a writer, a thinker, a teacher, and a critic of a very high order; but he seldom made himself conspicuous in public, and many thousands of readers were through his long years of intellectual activity greatly influenced by his work, who perhaps never knew his name, or associated him directly with the productions which came from his pen. He was born in London in 1826, and belonged to a family which had for some time held an important position in the Unitarian denomination. Richard Hutton received much of his education at the London University, and afterwards in Germany, and it was intended that he should become a Unitarian minister. He was in fact actually received into the ministry; but he never preached, and soon ceased to perform any of the ministerial functions. He had a gift of writing, which proved to be the great possession of his worldly career, and he became the principal writer for the *Inquirer*, then the recognised exponent of Unitarian doctrines. His views on religious subjects seemed gradually to undergo a certain process of change; and although he does not appear to have actually broken away from those with whom he was, during the previous part of his life, associated in religious doctrines, he no

longer showed himself in harmony with their opinions as to doctrines of which he had once been a thorough champion. In 1861 he became one of the two leading editors of the *Spectator*, and at a later period had full editorial control over it. The *Spectator* never in our time exercised greater influence over the public of these countries, and over the educated world abroad as well as at home, than it did while under the guidance of Mr. Hutton. In literary and artistic exposition, and in thoughtful illustration of all great political and public questions, the *Spectator* created a school of culture which recognised that journal as its guide and main source of inspiration. There were few intellectual men and women who did not read the *Spectator* in this country, and it was known to be absolutely independent and sincere in its judgments. Richard Hutton was the master of a style singularly clear, persuasive, and attractive, without any of the showy and false ornament which a writer who desires to captivate the taste of the public is sometimes misled into adopting for the mere sake of making his productions effective at the flash of the moment. He wrote for readers of culture, for scholars and thinkers, and he became popular by the exercise of that pure and high art so often supposed to shut itself in from popularity. There were many who never had the fortune to agree with Mr. Hutton in any of his main principles and judgments, or in any

of the political opinions he set forth from week to week, and who yet felt that something of value had passed away from their lives when Richard Hutton ceased to write.

The name of Neal Dow—General Neal Dow during a great part of his career—may be enclosed in our list of deaths, because he sprang from a Norfolk family, and because he often visited England, and was a conspicuous figure whenever he came here. Neal Dow was from his earliest manhood a determined advocate of teetotalism. He went so far in advance of most other celebrated champions of temperance, Father Mathew among the rest, that he wished to enforce teetotalism by statute law. He was born in 1804 in Portland, Maine, and in his boyhood was devoted to books, but was also remarkably successful in all athletic exercises, in riding, swimming, rowing, and sword-play. He went into political life early, with the especial purpose of carrying on the agitation for making the sale of drink penal in the State of Maine. Through his influence and by his action measures for the repression of the drink traffic were introduced again and again in the Legislature of the State of Maine, and his persevering efforts succeeded in establishing that Maine liquor law which afforded subject for discussion in most parts of the world. In 1857 Neal Dow visited England, whither his fame had preceded him, and was greeted with enthusiasm by the extreme advocates of legally

enforced teetotalism. As to the working of the Maine liquor law in the State of Maine, many visitors from England, who took all the means they could to form a just estimate of its influence, became convinced that, even at the time of its most rigid enforcement, it was often eluded, and that a great deal of secret drinking was daily and nightly carried on, despite all the efforts of the authorities. The experiment of repressive legislation was tried in several other States of the Union, but did not prove successful anywhere. Up to the outbreak of the Civil War in the United States, Neal Dow was known only as the apostle of repressive legislation for the drink traffic, but in that capacity his name made itself known all over the world.

On the secession of the Southern States, Neal Dow entered on a new chapter in his career. He threw his whole heart and soul into the cause of the Union, and not only volunteered as a soldier, but by his own exertions raised a regiment, of which he afterwards became Colonel, and took the field in the service of Abraham Lincoln. He rose rapidly, and in 1863 obtained the rank of General, which he had fairly earned by his bold and skilful action. He commanded a brigade which entered New Orleans with General Butler, and in the same year he received three severe wounds while engaged in an almost desperate fight to storm Port Hudson. While Neal Dow lay on the field, to all appearance dead or dying, he was discovered

by a scattering group of Confederate troops, was captured by them, and carried off as a prisoner to Richmond. He passed eight months in captivity, and was then exchanged by the Confederates for one of their general officers taken by the Northern troops. With this his military career came to a close, for he never recovered sufficiently from his wounds to take to the battle-field again before the end of the war. His vigorous health returned after a long interval, and for many years he resumed his unceasing advocacy of law-imposed teetotalism. There is perhaps no other instance in recent generations of a man having won distinction mainly as a preacher of temperance, and then having suddenly varied his whole course of life by entering the army, rising to the rank of General, taking a conspicuous part in many great battles, and for a time making people forget the preacher of temperance in the daring military officer. In 1875 he paid his last visit to England, and again received a warm welcome from the advocates of prohibitory legislation. When the Presidential election was coming on in 1880, the Prohibition party in the United States nominated him for the office of President, but the attempt did not command votes enough to have any chance of success. Such is in substance the whole of his story. His death took place almost suddenly, at his home in Portland, on the 2nd of October 1897. He had seen his ninety-third birthday before he passed out of life.

The death of Francis Newman on October 4 was an event deserving a marked place in the history of the Victorian age. Francis Newman was a man not merely of great intellectual capacity, but of something like genius; and yet it must be owned that he never accomplished during his hard-working lifetime anything like the success which might fairly have been expected for him. He was the brother of John Henry Newman, the famous Cardinal; and he may well be regarded as Cardinal Newman's equal in mental capacity, in courage, and in full devotion to every cause which he believed to be just. He was a deep thinker and an unsparing worker—unsparing at least of himself and of his own toil. But the careers of the two Newmans were destined to be strangely different. We might speak of these brothers as Richter speaks of two others, and say that at an early period fate seized their bleeding hearts and flung them different ways. John Henry Newman became a member of the Church of Rome, worked for that faith with untiring zeal, and won for himself without premeditation, indeed, all unconsciously, a world-wide fame.

Francis Newman went to the other extreme of thought, and became what was called, in later days, an agnostic of the most uncompromising order. He did not, however, give himself up to the teaching of philosophic or scientific agnosticism, but devoted himself mainly to the advocacy of great reforms, which he believed to be essential to the progress of humanity, to the relief

of the oppressed, and to the welfare of his fellow-men. As to his sincerity and self-sacrificing spirit there could be no doubt; but he never accomplished that success which many great reformers, not higher than he in intellect and purpose, have been fortunate enough to achieve. There was always in him something of what irreverent criticism might describe as eccentricity; and he had the generous but perilous weakness which made him associate himself with public movements that could not lead to any fruitful result. He had no oratorical gifts, and he had not his brother's capacity for pleading a cause with exquisite persuasiveness, with a grace of mellifluous diction that often became true eloquence of its own kind. In the arena of political life here in our practical world his companionship and his support often counted for little or nothing, and, in the phraseology of American politics, he might have been described as a 'crank.' His instincts seemed to lead him away from the crowd into some remote corner where a group of dreamers sat planning out schemes of immeasurable or impossible reform. He was a living type of the 'might-have-beens'—those might-have-beens which Carlyle scornfully puts away as for the most part a vanity. Yet it is certain that he made a mark upon the intellect of his time, and that many of his thoughts, written or spoken, will be found coming up again and again in public memory and use even where this authorship is not known. Some of his writings,

such as 'The Phases of Faith,' must always hold a place in literature; and he accomplished much for the teaching of Arabic and of mathematics during the days when he was a Professor in University College, London. Perhaps if he had been content to remain a writer of books on subjects of scholastic interest, he might have worked out for himself a career memorable in the history of educational development. But much of his temperament yearned after a life of greater activity; and whenever he saw what he believed to be a needed reform, he at once came out of his seclusion as a University teacher, and strove to form an association for the carrying on of the work, or to be an associate in a movement for that end. He was seldom on the side of the majority, and he never could understand the necessity for that compromise which Macaulay describes as the very essence of politics. Perhaps his noblest epitaph may be found in the almost universal disappointment which was felt in the fact that so many great gifts and such a noble nature should not have won a higher place in the history of his country.

The world of popular art, a very distinct world in itself, suffered a severe loss by the death of Sir John Gilbert. He died on the 5th of October at Blackheath, which was the place of his birth, a place with which he had been associated during his life of eighty years. Gilbert began life as a bank clerk in the City of London. He had from

his childhood shown a strong inclination for art; but his inclination was at first regarded merely as the common tendency among bright and clever boys to believe themselves designed for something better than the routine work of business. Fortunately for himself and for the English public, he proved a total failure in office work, and was set free to try his own venture in what he believed to be his own world. He had had but little actual training in art, indeed, his main education was given to him by himself and by his constant study of such masters as Rembrandt and Velasquez. He worked in oils and in water-colours, and in 1836 he exhibited in the Royal Academy. When the *Illustrated London News* was founded he became attached to it, and was one of its leading artists during the greater part of his career. He had just the gifts which qualified him for such work. He loved to illustrate romantic and chivalric subjects, and his artistic instincts enabled him to bring these subjects home to the mind and the appreciation of the general public. His wood engravings helped to secure for the *Illustrated London News* its immense popularity, and he published editions of Shakespeare, of Scott, of Don Quixote, adorned by drawings from his own hand. At one time he used to be called 'the Walter Scott of painting,' and there was in his peculiar genius much that justified this description of his place in art. In 1871 he became President of the Old Water-Colour Society, and soon

after this the Crown conferred upon him the honour of knighthood. He was a Member of the Royal Academy, and was generous in the presentation of his paintings to the Art Galleries of London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and other cities. His merits were appreciated abroad as well as in his own country, and he was made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour. Gilbert came into the world at the right period for one of his peculiar gifts and qualifications, for his career as a painter opened just at the time when his art began to be popularised by the great improvements in the practical business of illustration, which enabled his pictures to be sent in periodical form all over the reading world. The poet and the novelist have to be put into translations if their works are to be appreciated by foreign countries; but Gilbert's drawings in the *Illustrated London News* told all that he had to tell to every part of the world without need of any translation. He ranks with the popular rather than with the great artists, but his career must be regarded as within its own limits one of complete success.

On the 30th of December in the same year another English artist died who had won in his day a wide popularity. William Linton, one of the most celebrated wood engravers of his time, died at the age of seventy-five at Newhaven, Connecticut, United States. He had been a voluntary exile from his own country for more than thirty years. Linton, like Sir John Gilbert, was en-

gaged on the *Illustrated London News* from the time of its foundation, and continued to work for it during many years. He was a writer as well as a wood engraver, contributed largely to the *Westminster Review* and to several weekly papers, wrote 'A History of Wood Engraving,' and was the editor of more than one biographical series, and published many poems. He was a man of very high and varied qualifications, and in his own especial field of art must take rank with the foremost of its cultivators. The reader who follows with interest his remarkable and diversified career is often led to wonder why Linton did not win a greater and more enduring fame. Perhaps one explanation of this comparative failure may be found in the fact that Linton voluntarily gave himself up to many other pursuits as well as that of an artist. Unlike most men of the artistic order he was an ardent and intense politician, and his convictions often led him to stand up for a cause which was not likely to recommend him to the favour of art's wealthier patrons. He was an impassioned Chartist in his younger days, and was the political ally and close friend of Mazzini and Garibaldi. Nor in these political associations with the Italian leaders was he governed, as many other Englishmen of the time were, by hostility to the Papacy and the Church of Rome; for he was, during many years, a constant contributor of poems and ballads to the *Nation* newspaper, published in Dublin under the editorship of Charles Gavan

Duffy, to advocate the national cause of Catholic Ireland. In 1866 Linton went to the United States, and settled for a long time in New York. During the later years of his life he made his home at Newhaven in Connecticut, where his death took place. We may remind our readers that William Linton was the husband of Mrs. Lynn Linton, a woman who at one time held a high place among popular novelists and essayists.

A life of noble usefulness came to a close on the 27th of October, when the Princess Mary of Teck, second daughter of Frederick Duke of Cambridge, died after a short attack of an illness which had threatened to prove fatal more than once before. The Princess was married in June 1866 to the Duke of Teck. The Queen granted to the Duke and Duchess the use of White Lodge, Richmond Park, as their residence, and the Duchess soon endeared herself to all the neighbourhood by her liberal and well-disposed works of charity and benevolence. She was the chief mover in the establishment of a Home of Rest for poor London working women; gave up much of her attention to the training of young servant girls; lent much help at a time of singular need to the Society of Distressed Irish Ladies and to the foundation of village homes for the unhappy children of fathers or mothers condemned to prison. The daughter of the Duchess of Teck is, as of course every one knows, the present Princess of Wales. The Duchess of Teck was attacked, not

long after her daughter's marriage, by the dangerous malady from which she never recovered.

The Crown lost a valuable servant by the death of Lord Rosmead on the 28th of October. Lord Rosmead, who began life as Hercules George Robert Robinson, was the second son of Admiral Hercules Robinson, of Westmeath, in Ireland, who had won distinction as a naval officer, especially in the war of 1814 between England and the United States. Hercules Robinson, the younger, was for a time an officer in the 87th Regiment, but very soon obtained an appointment as a Colonial Governor, and, from the time of that appointment, spent the whole of his life in the rule of Colonial possessions and settlements. Before attaining to the position of Colonial Governor, he had held an appointment under the Crown which did not seem to give him much opportunity for the display of his characteristic qualities. A Commission was appointed by a Conservative Administration to inquire into the condition of fairs and markets in Ireland. Captain Robinson, as he then was, became chief commissioner in that peaceful and somewhat prosaic enterprise, a curious prelude to the career of wandering and adventure which afterwards won him distinction. The work of the Commission was to go round all the cities, towns, and villages in Ireland where markets were held, or ought to be held, to inquire into the manner in which each place fulfilled its requirements, and to ascertain what improvements could be made for

the benefit of local trade and agriculture. Hercules Robinson showed great capacity for his task, and a certain originality in his methods of obtaining the fullest information and turning it to the best account. He was endowed with the happy gift of humour, which might have appeared thrown away on the tasks thus far allotted to him; he had a remarkable gift of mimicry with which he often beguiled for his travelling companions the un-exhilarating routine of their work, and he had brilliant conversational powers. Those who were associated with him at the time felt quite certain that he must come to distinction, although they did not exactly foresee the life of adventure which was in store for him.

In 1854 Robinson was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of St. Christopher and of the Leeward Islands, and in 1859 he became Governor of Hong-Kong. He then passed on to Ceylon, and in 1872 he was removed or promoted to New South Wales. There he became deeply interested in the scheme for Australian federation, a movement which was then only vaguely beginning to shape itself, and beyond question he accomplished much in its direction towards a practical completion. He was afterwards appointed Governor of New Zealand, and at length, in the August of 1880, his capacity for Colonial rule was tried by a newer and severer test. He was made Governor of the Cape and High Commissioner of South Africa. In this position he had to undertake duties which might

have put a strain upon the highest capacity of Colonial statesmanship. The uprising of the Boer population in the Transvaal began soon after his appointment, and was followed by the armed struggle which ended at Majuba Hill in the victory, for the time, of the insurgent Dutch population. He took, as became his position, a leading part in the working of the negotiations, compromises, and other arrangements which went on from that time throughout the whole of his Government and to the end of his life. The movements inaugurated by Cecil Rhodes, the Jameson Raid, and all the other events which resulted in the annexation of the Transvaal Republic, were a continual disturbance to his statesmanship, and are probably working still for new and as yet perhaps unexpected consequences. Sir Hercules Robinson endeavoured, throughout the whole of his South African career, to carry out a policy of conciliation. His main object was to bring about some scheme of willing and cordial confederation in which the Dutch populations, the loyal English, and the various foreign settlers in that part of the world might act in harmonious union for the development of South Africa's resources as subjects of the British Crown. The task set before him may have been too great for any statesmanship just then to accomplish. The antagonism of the Dutch towards their British masters, the hatred which many of those masters felt towards the Dutch, and the difficulty of bring-

ing about any manner of combined action among the foreign settlers of various races who were seeking to enrich themselves in South Africa, created a stormy atmosphere, amid which it was hardly possible that the counsels of conciliation and of far-seeing prudence could make themselves widely effective.

We need not here recount the story of that struggle, which will be told, up to a certain date, in a further part of this volume, and of which indeed the full history remains yet to be revealed by events. But the careful and impartial student of that history, so far as it has gone, will be likely to come to the conclusion that Lord Rosmead, as he afterwards became, had seen his way farther and deeper into the settlement of the whole question than any other man holding high official position at that time. His health had been severely tried during his long career of Colonial governorship, and the difficulties of the task set before him in South Africa were becoming more and more oppressive to his failing physical resources. He was now more than seventy years old, and in the spring of 1897 he resigned his official position and returned for the last time to England. It is said, and may be easily understood, that he felt deeply disappointed by the comparative failure of his best efforts in South Africa, and that he was much hurt by the hostility displayed towards him by that large body of Englishmen who stigmatised every effort at the conciliation of the

Dutch in South Africa as a pro-Boer sympathy with the enemies of British Imperialism. Some English writers, who although opposed to him and his policy yet took a more moderate course, made their moderation hardly less offensive by excusing him on the plea that he was too old for the work of a statesman. His fame will clear as time goes on, and justice will be done to his memory.

On the 29th of October a sudden attack of illness brought about the death of Henry George, a man who had at one time carried with him, in America and England, almost as great a number of devoted followers and believers as Tolstoi has done in Russia. The name of Henry George is well entitled to a place in this volume, for he was known throughout Great Britain and Ireland, and had many times delivered lectures and addressed public meetings in these countries on the subjects which were dear to his heart. He was a citizen of the United States, and was born in Philadelphia in 1839. When very young he went to sea, but never became an ancient mariner, for before he was twenty years of age he had settled in California, and applied himself to the work that comes so naturally to clever Americans, the work of writing for and conducting a newspaper. During his residence in California he gave much study to the land question there, and was greatly impressed by the heedless manner in which vast expanses of land had been granted by the State and local authority to rail-

way companies and other corporate organisations. The idea began to be borne in upon his mind that the ownership of land by companies and by individuals must of necessity stand in the way of genuine social progress, must help the rich to grow richer and force the poor to grow poorer. Henry George became possessed by the conviction that under any such systems as those prevailing, even in what are recognised as highly civilised countries, the growth of wealth must necessarily mean a corresponding growth of poverty. The first book he published was called 'Our Land, and Land Policy.' In this he developed his general theory for the abolition of all taxes pressing upon industry and the lives of the poor. The book that won him his greatest fame was 'Progress and Poverty,' which appeared in 1879, and quickly found many readers in Europe as well as in the United States. Indeed he became for a while the prophet of many social, or socialistic, organisations and of masses of people in his own land and on the European side of the Atlantic. His writings had in them all the charm of that glow which comes from thorough and passionate conviction, and he wrote with much eloquence and impressiveness, although when he addressed a public meeting—a task he had incessantly to undertake—he showed little or none of the orator's gift. He was a champion of Free Trade. He had no hesitation at any time in proclaiming his faith on this or that subject, even though that expression of faith

made him for the time unpopular among those who, if he were guided by selfish ambitions, he might have been anxious to propitiate. He was more than once urged by his followers to put himself forward as a candidate for public office, to which his own inclinations would never have led him. During the later years of his life he settled in New York, where he conducted a weekly newspaper for the advocacy of his own opinions on industrial and political questions. With regard to those opinions it may fairly be said that he had got hold of some half-truths at least—that he had thoroughly comprehended the weaknesses and the defects of certain social systems, and had opened the way for a more complete revival, and for the gradual development of better social systems. Henry George did not commit himself to the doctrines of socialism in the broader sense, or to any theory that aimed at social revolution either moral or political. He kept himself to those questions which concerned merely the limits of State interference between the aggrandisement of certain classes and the industrial efforts of the working community. He was a strong advocate of Home Rule for Ireland, and he advocated that cause, according to his own words, not merely by reason of his sympathy with the Irish demand, but also because of his sincere wish for the good of England and the peaceful prosperity of England's people.

One of the deaths which marked the close of

this year would call for especial mention, if only because of the strange event which brought it about. This death was that of Mr. William Terriss, one of the most popular and distinguished actors in London. On the 16th of December Mr. Terriss was entering a private door of the Adelphi Theatre in London, when a man, who had been waiting near the theatre, suddenly rushed at him and stabbed him. The stab was a death-blow, for Mr. Terriss lingered but for a short time after his friends in the theatre had come to lift him from the ground. The murderer was found to be a man who had been employed as a supernumerary at the theatre, and the assumption at first was that this person might have got it into his mind that he had some cause of grievance against Mr. Terriss, and had thus taken his revenge. It did not appear, however, that Mr. Terriss had ever had any dealings with the man which would have given ground for such an idea, and the conclusion therefore came to was that Mr. Terriss had been the victim of a murderous assault made by a mere maniac. Apart from the natural public horror at the crime, there was a profound sense of regret felt everywhere at the sudden close thus forced upon the career of a brilliant and successful actor who was only in his prime when his murderer came upon him. William Terriss is likely to be remembered chiefly because of his thoroughly picturesque and life-like impersonations of the young hero in the melodramas so long associated with the Adelphi Theatre. But he

was capable, and had proved himself capable, of displaying a higher dramatic art than these pieces could illustrate, for he had often appeared successfully in Shakespearean parts. He was a man who threw his whole soul into every task he undertook, and the London stage was all the poorer because of that maniacal stroke which brought William Terriss to the grave.

One of the premature deaths of the year was that of Sir Frank Lockwood, whose bright light went out on the 19th of December, at his home in South Kensington. Frank Lockwood was only in his fifty-first year when his brilliant and successful career came to an end. He was born in Manchester, and received his early education at Manchester Grammar School, from which he passed on to St. Paul's School, London, and afterwards took his degree at Caius College, Cambridge. He studied for the bar, and was received into the profession at Lincoln's Inn in 1872. His success as a barrister was rapid; he became Queen's Counsel in 1882, was appointed Recorder of Sheffield two years after, and held that position until 1894. He was one of the most eloquent advocates of his time, a skilful and subtle cross-examiner, and had a keen perception of character, and a marvellous power of ready wit and humour.

Lockwood was gifted with very varied tastes, and among them a strong love of literature and of art. His skill with the pencil might have won him high repute if he had never gone in for any-

thing but the culture of art; and he contributed at one time many spirited caricatures to *Punch*. But he had also a strongly developed love for political life, and he made up his mind to enter the House of Commons. He was an advanced Liberal in his political creed, and as such he stood for two constituencies without success. Frank Lockwood was not a man to be turned easily from any purpose he had in view, and accordingly he made a third effort, and the third attempt accomplished its proverbial success. He was elected member for York in 1885, and soon won a reputation as one of the most ready, skilful, and brilliant debaters in the House of Commons. He became a great favourite in the House, for, while he never sacrificed, suppressed, or even softened any of his strong political opinions to win the approval of his opponents, there was always a spirit of genial good temper and of sympathetic courtesy in him which disarmed party hostility and won him friends on the side he opposed, as well as on the side he supported. He was the most delightful of companions and the most sincere of friends.

When Lord Rosebery came into power, Frank Lockwood was made Solicitor-General. He had taken a leading part in some of the most important law cases tried during his time. In the autumn of 1896, Lord Russell of Killowen was invited to deliver the annual address before the American Bar Association, at Saratoga Springs,

and he was accompanied on this honourable expedition by Frank Lockwood. A friend who was with them on this visit to America has contributed to Mr. Barry O'Brien's *Life of Lord Russell of Killowen* an amusing illustration of Lockwood's humour and artistic skill. Having described the steamer reaching Sandy Hook, and the crowding on board of interviewers and the newspaper artists, who came to sketch Lord Russell, the writer goes on thus:—

‘Lockwood quietly strolled in the direction of the stern, turned his back on the Chief and every one else, and in a few moments produced an admirable likeness of him, arrayed in judicial robes and wig. Returning to the little knot of journalists, he said, “Would you like to know how the Chief-Justice looks when he is presiding in his own Court? If so, I make you all a present of this.” Instantly every note-book was closed amid a chorus of grateful acknowledgments, and this portrait, and no other, appeared next day as a woodcut in the leading illustrated papers.’ The anecdote is so pleasantly characteristic of Lockwood's artistic skill and his humorous ways, that it may fairly find a place in a volume of grave history. Sir Frank Lockwood made a deep impression on the American Bar, and on many highly cultured Americans during this visit, which was in every sense of interest to him. His friends were full of hope that he had long years of increasing honours and increasing happiness before

him, when the illness came on which led to his premature death.

The name of Sir Henry Marsham Havelock-Allan, who was killed on the 30th of December by the shot of an Afridi enemy during one of the engagements in India, must have a record in this death-roll, were it only because of his father's name and fame. He was the son of the illustrious Sir Henry Havelock, and in his very earliest experiences of warfare had succeeded in winning official commendation from his father for his services on the battle-field. During the Indian Mutiny the young man was acting as aide-de-camp to his father, who tells in his despatch that 'In the combat at Cawnpore Lieutenant Havelock was my Aide-de-Camp. The 64th Regiment had been much under artillery fire, from which it had severely suffered. The whole of the infantry were lying down in line, when, perceiving that the enemy had brought out the last reserved gun—a 24-pounder—and were rallying round it, I called upon the regiment to rise and advance. Without another word from me, Lieutenant Havelock placed himself on his horse, in front of the centre of the 64th, opposite the muzzle of the gun. Major Stirling, commanding the regiment, was in front, dismounted; but the Lieutenant continued to move steadily on in front of the regiment, at a foot-pace, on his horse. The gun discharged shot until the troops were within a short distance, when they fired grape. In went the corps led by the

Lieutenant, who still steered steadily on the gun's muzzle until it was mastered by a rush of the 64th.'

This was indeed a genuine baptism of fire, for the young officer, Lieutenant Havelock, was soon after promoted to a captaincy, and took part in many daring actions. He bore himself splendidly in the capture of Lucknow, and he twice saved, by his prompt energy, the life of General Outram. The greater part of his career was one of active service, and wherever there was a perilous campaign Havelock was certain to be at the front. He had even something to do with campaigns in which England had no share; for during the war between France and Germany, and that between Russia and Servia, he acted as occasional correspondent for English newspapers. In 1874, during a pause in his active military career, he became a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons, and was elected as representative of Sunderland as an advanced Liberal. Then came another interval of military service, after which he returned to political life, obtained once more a seat in the House of Commons, and became a Liberal-Unionist. Returning more lately to India, he met, as we have said, his death-wound in the passes of the Khaibar. He had assumed in 1880, by a royal licence, the name of Allan in addition to his own patronymic, in accordance with the wish expressed in the will of a near relative. It may be added here, although it has already been told in a former volume of this

History, that he was the first who bore the title of Sir Henry Havelock. The title had been already ordered for his illustrious father, but the message from the Queen which conveyed it only reached its destination when the man for whom it was destined was lying dead. ‘Like father, like son,’ might well be set forth as a brief description of the two men. .

CHAPTER XI.

THE DEATH-ROLL OF 1898.

THE death of Prince Bismarck was not an event belonging in the strict sense to the history of England ; but it was none the less one which made a profound impression on the people of England, as well as on every other civilised people in the world. For this reason I record it first in the death-roll of this chapter. Prince Bismarck had indeed played so commanding, and in some instances so reconstructing, a part in the history of Europe, that his death may be regarded as an event belonging to the history of every European country. When the death of the great Prussian statesman, which followed soon after Gladstone's was known in London, a member of the House of Commons observed, somewhat irreverently but quite correctly, that the death of Bismarck was the only event to be recorded in an obituary which would not have seemed an anti-climax after the death of Gladstone. Bismarck had made greater changes in the political and national affairs of Europe, or at least of the European Continent, than any

other man had done since the days of the great Napoleon. There was this difference between the changes accomplished by the two men, that while the work of Napoleon was for its time more widespread and more varied, it was for the most part not destined to endure; while, so far as ordinary human observation can judge, much or most of Bismarck's work is destined to abide. The great Chancellor raised his native land to a commanding position among the States of Europe. He converted Prussia, which had previously been regarded only as a well-drilled military power, capable of rendering good service as an ally in time of war, into the strongest and, on the whole, the most united State on the European Continent.

Mr. Browning has written of the man who 'held up his Piedmont to the light till she suddenly smiled and was Italy.' Bismarck held his Prussia up to the light till she suddenly smiled and was Germany. He was in every way a remarkable figure in political life, even if we take him altogether apart from his marvellous achievements in the development of his country. His was a physical form to attract the attention of any one who saw him for the first time; no stranger could pass Bismarck in the street without turning to look after him and wondering who he might be. Bismarck was one of the tallest among the statesmen of his day; and, although he could not be considered handsome in features, his

face and head carried with them suggestions of great intellectual power. He was widely and deeply read in literature and in history, and was a careful student of English authors. He knew English thoroughly, and could speak it with fluency and accuracy. Indeed, except for his strong German accent, he might be said to speak the English language to perfection, and was not a little proud of his skill in that way. His speeches in the Prussian Parliament were often illumined by the happiest and most apposite quotations from Shakespeare, and he never introduced an over-familiar citation. He often quoted from the works of great modern English writers, such as Macaulay and John Stuart Mill. He was not an orator in the higher sense of the word, but he was a most ready, impressive, and convincing Parliamentary debater.

Bismarck was capable of strong political likings, and also of strong dislikes. It must be said, without undue depreciation of his high qualities, that when he believed some especial policy was needed at the moment for the promotion of his country's interests, he was often quite unscrupulous as to the means by which his end was to be achieved. Louis Napoleon was understood at one time to have a poor opinion of Bismarck's capacity; but we may take it for granted that before the career of the third French Emperor had reached its close, he must have come to form a very different judgment as to the political capacity of

his great opponent. Bismarck had evidently set before him one grand object, to which the whole of his strength was to be devoted, and that object was the elevation of his own country to the highest position among Continental nations. In that work he unquestionably succeeded. He found Prussia in a condition of what might almost be called actual subordination to Austria in the Germanic League, over which up to his time Austria formally presided, and he succeeded before very long in making Prussia the dominant German State, in making her the controller of Germany's destinies, in absolutely excluding Austria from any share in the new Germanic Empire. So far as the observer of passing history can forecast the future, there does not seem any probability that the German Empire, as created by Bismarck, will break up again, or will offer the slightest opportunity for any successful foreign intervention. In that sense his career, taken as a whole, may be said to have brought a promise of peace to the people for whose advancement he had worked so long. It was, indeed, a peace brought about by the most venturesome war; but there were other daring constructors of empire in his own days and in other days, whose policy only led from one war to another, and gave no promise of abiding peace as its result. Bismarck accomplished almost as much for his own country as Washington did for the American Republic; but his methods and his political morals were very different from those which

governed the unselfish and thoroughly noble career of the man who created the United States. The world seemed to pause and to hold its breath while Prince Bismarck was dying. The statesmanship of Continental Europe during the reign of Queen Victoria lost its greatest figure when Bismarck, of late somewhat divided in counsels and in companionship from the Sovereign whose Empire he had founded, ceased to be a living influence, and passed away into history. He died on the 30th of July.

The opening days of the year were marked by the disappearance of a memorable figure from the Parliament and the public life of England. On the 16th of January, Charles Pelham Villiers, one of the earliest and most influential leaders of that great Free Trade movement which was supported by Cobden and Bright, and carried into legislation by Sir Robert Peel, died at his house in London. Charles Villiers had long outlived the ordinary period of man's duration on this earth. He was ninety-six years and a few days old when he died, rather suddenly. His death was believed to have been hastened by his overtasking himself in entertaining his friends and his tenants on the occasion of his latest birthday anniversary. Charles Villiers had been known for many years as the 'Father of the House of Commons'—in other words, the man who had been for the longest unbroken period a member of the representative assembly. He had retained his physical activity

almost to the end, and although during his latest years he was not regular in his attendance at the House, yet, when an important division was expected, he might safely be counted on by his political friends as a voter in the lobby. Until a very short time before his death, he had been welcomed on such occasions by members of all parties in the House, and he had a friendly and genial word for every one who approached him.

Charles Villiers belonged by birth and family to the aristocratic order. He became a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons when he was twenty-four years of age, but did not carry the election. He was afterwards called to the bar, practised for a while on the Western Circuit, and received several official appointments. He still retained his strong desire to enter the House of Commons, and in 1834 was elected for Wolverhampton as a Liberal and Free Trader, at a time when Free Trade was made especially attractive to the working classes by its association with the familiar words, 'cheap bread.' He continued to represent the same constituency for fifty years, and after that time, when reconstruction took place in Parliamentary constituencies, he became member for a division in the same district, which was represented by him until the close of his useful life. The story of that life is indeed the history of the Free Trade movement in England. For session after session Villiers brought on in the House of Commons a motion

for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and he frequently addressed great public meetings held in all parts of the country to advocate the cause. For some time after he had begun his agitation the Free Trade party numbered only thirty-eight votes in the division lobby of the House, but in 1840 no less than 116 members gave their votes in favour of his motion. Before long Charles Villiers had the support of Cobden's convincing arguments and 'unadorned eloquence,' and the splendid oratory of John Bright.

We need not retrace the progress of the anti-Corn Law movement to its triumph under Sir Robert Peel. Villiers was not in any sense of the word an orator; he had not the imagination, the artistic style, or the thrilling delivery which are understood to be the essential characteristics of the genuine orator. But he had a marvellous power of arraying telling arguments, and of compelling the attention even of the most listless and the least sympathetic audience. He devoted his whole life to the task he had undertaken, and he made himself one of the greatest influences in the cause of Free Trade until it had accomplished its success. From that time he showed a deep interest in many questions of political and social reform, and he more than once held office in a Liberal Government. He had no personal ambition, and he declined the offer of a peerage in 1885, making, it must be owned, no great sacrifice by that refusal, for his rank already was secure, and to a man of

his temperament the House of Lords would have been a poor exchange for the House of Commons. One of Charles Villiers' most remarkable and impelling qualities was the deep and steady interest he took in all that part of life's business which came within his direct observation. He had undoubtedly for his guidance the firmest convictions on most of the great subjects with which political life occupies itself; and until the close of his existence he was a constant occupant of his seat in the House of Commons long after he had ceased to make speeches there. The atmosphere of politics was for him always healthful and inspiring. But he had also a keen interest in subjects which had little or nothing to do with his own special mission; and he was fond of studying the lives of various classes of people in London who would not in the ordinary course of things have come within the sphere of his observation. It was known to many of his friends that he loved, like the Caliph in the 'Arabian Nights,' to make quiet visitations into obscure quarters of the great city where he lived, in order to gain some practical knowledge of the ways and the lives of the inhabitants. A sincere and unvarying desire to improve the conditions of existence for the poor and the dependent animated him throughout the whole of his career, and yet he never put himself forward as a professional or even a professing philanthropist. During a great part of his Free Trade campaign, he was somewhat cast into

the shade by the higher debating powers of his two political colleagues, Cobden and Bright. But his name was and ever must be associated with the triumph of the Free Trade cause. His career was one of the longest and fullest known to English history. He began life some years before the birth of Cobden and long before the birth of Bright, and he survived Cobden for more than thirty years and Bright for nearly nine years.

On the 17th of January at her residence, Pembroke Lodge, Richmond Park, died Frances, Countess Russell, widow of the statesman who, in the years of his greatest political activity and success, was famous throughout the world as Lord John Russell, and was afterwards Earl Russell. Lady Russell, his widow, was one of the most interesting and attractive figures in the society of her own time—none the less attractive, it may be, because she never made the slightest effort to become what is called a queen of society. She lived for the most part, considering her station and her surroundings, a comparatively retired life, although she never failed to act as companion and support to her husband in all the social duties which his rank and his official life imposed upon him. Lady Russell did not care much about show and glitter and splendour, but she loved the companionship of intellectual, cultured, artistic men and women, and in her long married life she had ample opportunities of knowing every one who was worth knowing in these islands and in many

parts of the Continent. During her widowhood she still kept up the society of those whom she regarded as her friends. After a time she gave up altogether her London home, and lived with her daughter, Lady Agatha Russell, in Pembroke Lodge, a charming residence within the delightful precincts of Richmond Park. Her son, Lord Amberley, a young man who at one time gave proof of distinction both in literature and politics, had died before the death of his father. In her later years Lady Russell and her daughter lived alone in that home where she and Lord Russell had so long spent the intervals when they were free to enjoy the breath of country air and the scenery of the river. She was a woman of remarkable intellect and high culture, with a thorough appreciation of all that was best in literature and art, a keen interest in political life, and a close attention to the developments of modern science. Lady Russell was in heart and mind a patriotic Englishwoman—patriotic in the true sense of that often misused word. Her highest wish for her country was that it should ever be on the right side, and not merely that it should win success whether right or wrong. She would have justice done to the poorest of England's dependencies as to the poorest class of British subjects; and the cause of political freedom, of religious equality, of a career open to merit, of relief for the oppressed, and of all efforts to uplift the lowly, had no truer friend than she always proved her-

self to be. Even apart from the share which she had by her counsels and her sympathy in her husband's distinguished career, she won a name for herself which must always hold a place of honour in the history of that time to which she belonged.

James Stansfeld, who died on February 17, was a remarkable and impressive type of the advanced Radical. He was born on March 5, 1820, was the son of a Halifax solicitor, and received his education at University College, London. He studied at the Middle Temple, and became a barrister; but never devoted himself to the business of the profession. He was a member of the Unitarian denomination. He threw himself early into political agitation in favour of religious equality, extended suffrage, the abolition of all disqualifications standing in the way of manhood's career, and the abolition also of the legal restrictions which prohibit women from free competition with men in the struggle for livelihood, for distinction, and for the rights of citizenship. His creed would have been summed up in other days as the advocacy of liberty, equality, and fraternity; but he added to that creed an article, which was then only coming into definite recognition—the article declaring for the principle of nationality. That principle, although it has from all ages inspired the common action of every nation, given impulse to poetry and music, to political movement and to war, and has been, in its perverted sense, the impelling motive to war of conquest as well as war of defence,

was only beginning in the nineteenth century to make itself a distinct element of consideration in the minds of thoughtful and enlightened politicians. It was then a growing faith even among practical politicians that the welfare of humanity is most likely to be attained when separate nationalities are allowed or enabled to shape their own systems of government as far as possible.

Italy was then the country which best illustrated the application of this principle. Her more modern history had been that of a country divided under several systems of foreign rule, under Austrian rulers, Spanish rulers, French rulers, but never allowed a chance of showing what she could become under Italian rule. A passionate cry of Italian nationality was ringing almost unceasingly in the world's ears, and national efforts were made from time to time to obtain Italy's soil for the Italians. Stansfeld became one of the most eloquent and devoted advocates of that claim. He was brought into close association with Mazzini, and he continued throughout his life to be one of the sincerest friends of the great Italian leader. Stansfeld meanwhile was taking an active part in the promotion of advanced Liberal principles throughout the English constituencies. He was one of the earliest advocates of the movement for the repeal of all taxes imposed upon the spread of knowledge, such taxes as the stamp duties on newspapers, which rendered it impossible in those days to sell a daily newspaper at a price that would allow it to come into the

homes of the poorer classes. He spoke often on public platforms in his own part of the country—indeed throughout most parts of the country—and was very successful as a popular speaker. He was a man of remarkable eloquence, and his style combined the qualities of a high literary culture with a capacity for close practical argument, and a power of thrilling rhetorical appeal that told effectively on his audiences. His political principles were those which Conservative critics would probably have described as belonging to the demagogue, but there were intellectual and cultured qualities in his eloquence not usually to be found in the orations of the demagogue.

Such a man, if possessed by any ambition for a Parliamentary career, was not likely to be left long without an opportunity of entering the House of Commons. This opportunity was offered to Stansfeld in April 1859. He was then elected to Parliament for Halifax, the constituency to which he belonged by birth, and the constituency he continued to represent for the remainder of his life. In the House of Commons he associated himself for the most part, so far as home politics were concerned, with men like John Bright; but the interest he took in foreign and especially in Italian affairs made a certain distinction between him and most of Bright's other followers, who, like Bright himself, seldom associated themselves with any cause not concerning the interests of the British people. Some of his early speeches in the

House of Commons were delivered in vindication of the character and policy of the Young Italy party, and he paid a most eloquent and impressive tribute to the memory of Count Cavour on the death of that great statesman. Stansfeld made the acquaintance of Garibaldi when the Italian soldier-patriot visited England in 1862, and the two men, as was but natural, became close friends.

It will readily be understood that a Liberal of Stansfeld's temperament, who combined a poetical enthusiasm for the cause of Italian liberty with a thoroughly consistent and practical devotion to the advancement of Liberal principles in home politics, was likely to attract the attention and win the admiration of Gladstone. Through Gladstone's influence Stansfeld was appointed, in April 1863, a Junior Lord of the Admiralty in Lord Palmerston's administration. Stansfeld had been early acquainted with the ways of practical business, and he would soon have learned how to make himself really useful in his new position, but he was not long allowed the chance of training himself for the work of the Admiralty office. His well-known friendship with Mazzini gave his political opponents a sudden and quite unexpected chance of rendering his official position intolerable to him. The story is told in a former volume of this history. The absurd talk and scandal which the whole event created wounded the sensitive feelings of Stansfeld, and he expressed a wish to relieve the Government of his presence. Lord Palmerston advised him to

remain, but it is possible that Stansfeld did not find the Prime Minister very urgent in his pressure. He held to his resolution, and retired for a while into private life. But he was not left long out of office. In 1866, when Lord John Russell became Prime Minister, Stansfeld was made Under-Secretary of State for War. For a long time after, whenever a Liberal Government was in power, Stansfeld held important office, and obtained universal recognition as a most careful, capable, and successful administrator of any department he undertook to conduct.

Stansfeld had, however, one enemy more powerful than any which party hostility could raise against him, and that enemy was continuous ill-health. He was too conscientious a man not to devote himself to official work while he held a place in an administration, and he had a keen relish for the life of the House of Commons, but the combination of duties told heavily against him. His friends soon became sadly convinced that if he were to persevere in overtaxing his physical energies the result must be an utter breakdown. When the general election came on in 1895, Stansfeld withdrew from political life altogether. It was commonly said that the Liberal Government had, before the dissolution, offered him a peerage. There is every reason to believe that the offer was actually made, but Stansfeld was about the last man likely to feel any ambition for a title, or for a seat in the House of Lords. Although a man of ample means,

he had always lived a life of unostentatious simplicity, and those who knew him could not realise the idea of his allowing himself to be metamorphosed into a peer. Retirement from Parliamentary life and from official work came all too late for the restoration of Stansfeld's health. He had lived, however, to a good old age, and had left behind him the memory of an honourable, a brilliant, and a stainless career.

The science of healing lost during this year two of its most eminent exponents. The first of these to quit the living world was Sir Richard Quain, who died on March 13, 1898, in his eighty-sixth year. Sir Richard Quain, although one of the most hard-working and studious members of his profession, was a man who loved the companionship of authors, artists, statesmen, and was for many years before his death one of the most familiar figures in distinguished social gatherings of London. Richard Quain was an Irishman; he was born near to that Blackwater of which Spenser sang with such exquisite melody, and belonged to a family several of whose members distinguished themselves in medicine or in law. He began to receive education at a small local school, and it was at first intended by his parents that he should go into business under his mother's brother, who was a tanner, and who held out to him hopes of becoming ultimately the owner of the business. There was much distress in Ireland at the time, and Quain's father was anxious that the

youth should be put in a fair way of entering into a lucrative occupation. Young Quain had, however, a strong inclination for the medical profession, and had already been articled to a medical practitioner in Limerick. His mother had the good sense to see that her son's inclinations were well justified, and by her influence the tannery project was put aside, and the faculty of medicine obtained the services of one of its most brilliant and successful modern practitioners. Before long he became house surgeon and then house physician to University College Hospital, London, and from that time his career was one of ever-growing usefulness, distinction, and success. We need not follow out in this page the successive stages or record the various triumphs of that career.

In 1865 Richard Quain was appointed a member of a Royal Commission then formed to inquire into the causes and endeavour to prevent the further spread of an invading evil which was threatening heavy disaster, the cattle plague. This malady was new to England, having been brought into the island from abroad. It had already proved a visitation of disaster to English cattle, and threatened something like universal destruction to British herds. Dr. Quain studied the subject with his usual promptness and penetration. He came to the conclusion that there could be only one effective remedy for the threatened evil. That remedy he believed to be the unqualified prohibition of any moving of cattle from infected districts, the imme-

diate slaughter of all beasts which exhibited any symptoms of infection, and of all animals imported for food at the place of debarkation before they could be moved living into the country. These views of Dr. Quain proved much too strong for the acceptance of any of his colleagues on the Commission. The whole public opinion of the country seemed to be entirely opposed to such a stringent and comprehensive course of action. Dr. Quain went to work for the maintenance of his views with characteristic energy, patience, and vividness of illustration. He wrote letters to the newspapers, published articles in reviews and medical journals, delivered lectures, and in fact carried on a regular crusade in maintenance of his own opinions. His happy faculty of humour enabled him to make his arguments at once attractive and intelligible to the ordinary reader. As the result of his efforts the Commission, converted by his irresistible advocacy of his case, succeeded in completely extirpating the disease. Dr. Quain published a 'Dictionary of Medicine,' and delivered many lectures to the College of Physicians, and never indeed allowed himself any rest from professional and other intellectual labour. He was created a baronet in 1891. For some years he showed no relaxation either in mental or physical activity, he went about his work and kept up his pleasant social life as if he were still in the prime of manhood. Even after the illness had set in with which his break-

down in health began, he arose from his sick-bed in June 1897 to read before the Royal Society an essay on the 'Mechanism by which the First Sound of the Heart is Produced.' That long illness lasted with intervals until his death.

Carlyle, in his history of 'The French Revolution,' closes a passage full of grim humour and melancholy concerning Dr. Guillotin with the words 'his name like to outlive Cæsar's.' If there were any such likelihood in regard to the name of Guillotin, the same probability might exist, although for very different reasons, with regard to the name of Bessemer. Sir Henry Bessemer, who died on March 13, has left a name which is indissolubly connected with the greatest development of the steel industry the world has yet seen. The name of Bessemer is not indeed like to outlive Cæsar's, for the good reason that so long as any language remains to this world the name of Cæsar will be known amongst men. But it is quite certain that Sir Henry Bessemer's discovery of the method by which pig-iron may be easily, quickly, and cheaply converted into steel will make his name remembered for ever in the history of industrial development. The United States have already paid more than one enduring tribute to the name. In some of the richest coal and iron districts of the American Republic a new town, destined probably to become a great city, has been built which bears the name of Bessemer, as a tribute to the great work accomplished for

human history by the eminent man whose death is recorded here.

Bessemer was a born inventor, and seems to have taken from his earliest days to the study of inventions as other youths take to the study of painting or music or literature. The outbreak of the Crimean War naturally brought the subject of improved artillery under public attention throughout Europe, and Bessemer at once set himself to work for the discovery of better methods to be used in the construction of artillery. Happily he had not long to devote himself to the task of making war more rapid and effective in its destruction than it was before. He gave himself up to the development of a process, the principle of which was his own discovery, for the conversion of cast iron into cast steel. He constructed great works of his own, and for a long time had to struggle against a powerful array of hostile criticism and much strenuous opposition on the part of what may be called vested interests. The Bessemer process completely triumphed in the end, and created a new era for all the industries which depend upon the application of steam. He was the author of many great improvements in hydraulic machinery and in the construction of telescopes. His one conspicuous failure was his design for a passenger steamer, which, by means of a new principle introduced in the construction of its hull, was to save the passengers from the usual tossing and tumbling and frequent fits of sea-sickness caused

by the conflicting movements of the vessel and the waves. The steamer with which the experiment was made was named the *Bessemer*, but it is satisfactory to feel assured that that name will ever be associated with the inventor's great success and not with his one failure. In practical science as well as art, a man's fame is happily measured by his greatest success and not by some chance failure. Sir Henry Bessemer received the honour of knighthood from his own Sovereign and honours of various kinds from many foreign States.

James Payn, whose long career of active literary work came to an end on the 25th of March, might be regarded as a perfect type of a certain order of writers who just fall short of possessing the sacred gift of genius. He was clever, versatile, ready; his style was always attractive and often brilliant. He was industrious and untiring; he could succeed far enough in the mastery of any subject to become its expositor and illustrator with such luminous and happy touch as to secure the public attention. He wrote a great number of novels which were successful in obtaining a wide popularity, and had in them much genuine literary merit; and yet he was most assuredly not a great novelist, and did not even belong to that order of novelists whose works are sure of an abiding place in literature. He wrote countless essays and articles of various kinds in reviews, magazines, and newspapers. He was for some time editor of *Chambers's Journal*, and more lately of the *Cornhill Magazine*. He was

a charming talker, a genial companion, a thorough friend to his friend'; and although he had, during the later years of his life, to struggle with severe and painful illness, he never seemed to lose either his bright animal spirits or his faculty for continuous work. James Payn must have met and known during his years of celebrity almost every one who was worth knowing in England, and every one who made his acquaintance and who had any appreciation of intellectual activity, of wit and humour, must have felt the charm of his companionship. In his earlier days he had known De Quincey and Harriet Martineau, and was the friend of Matthew Arnold. He was an enthusiastic and devoted admirer of Dickens, and may be said to have idolised Dickens the man, as much as Dickens the author. But it is only just to say that he did not, in the style of his writings, attempt any imitation of the inimitable humour of Dickens. His novels and his essays, whether destined to abiding celebrity or not, had at least the merit of being absolutely his own.

On the 27th of March, at Avondale, in the county of Wicklow, Ireland, died from the effects of an accident, a woman whose name would of itself entitle her to a place in the 'History of Our Own Times.' This woman was Delia Tudor Parnell, mother of Charles Stewart Parnell, the story of whose political career has been told in previous volumes of this work. Delia Parnell was the daughter of Commodore Stewart, of the

United States Navy, who had won distinction for himself by many brilliant feats of seamanship and arms during the war concerning the right of search which was waged between Great Britain and the American Republic from 1812 to 1815. Miss Stewart married, in 1834, J. H. Parnell, of Avondale, a son of the Parnell who was Lord Chancellor of Ireland while Grattan's Parliament still existed. The Parnells were an old English family, which had been settled in Ireland since the days of Charles II. Thus it came about that the most conspicuous and powerful leader of the Irish Nationalist movement since the days of Daniel O'Connell was English by his father's side and American on his mother's side. Mrs. Parnell was a woman of remarkable mental capacity, and had a taste for literature which descended much more distinctly to one of her daughters than to her more famous son. Even after that son became famous by his leadership of the Irish National movement, Mrs. Parnell continued to live most of her life in her American home. Two of Mrs. Parnell's daughters were devoted to their brother's political cause, and one of them, Fanny Parnell, wrote spirited verses and clever articles in its support. Mrs. Parnell was seventy-nine years of age when the accident befell her which caused her death. She had outlived her son for nearly seven years.

On the 1st of April 1898 there died in the utter obscurity of a small Marylebone street, London, a man who had at one time made him-

self the object of talk, argument, wonder, and excitement to the whole civilised world. This man was Arthur Orton, the story of whose extraordinary attempt at imposture had been for years the theme of almost unceasing description and discussion in the newspapers of every land where newspapers are published. Arthur Orton was the son of a butcher at Wapping, who had emigrated to Australia, where the young Orton was brought up. There is a great English family bearing the name of Tichborne, the representative of which, Sir Roger Tichborne, then a young man, was supposed to have perished in the wreck of the *Bella*, a vessel that had sailed from a port in South America some years before the story of the Tichborne imposture began. Suddenly there came to England a man who claimed to be the rightful heir to the title and property, who declared that he had been rescued from the sinking vessel and been landed safely in Australia.

The story of this audacious attempt at imposture has been told in one of the volumes of this History, and is, even yet, too well remembered by the world in general to need recapitulation. The Claimant, as he was commonly called at the time, began his case in May 1871, and it lasted for 103 days. He had then to submit to a non-suit, and was immediately prosecuted for perjury. After a trial lasting for nearly a year, he was found guilty and sentenced to fourteen years of penal servitude. In 1895 he made a

complete confession of his guilt; but even after that confession he found here and there throughout the country some still unconverted believers, who maintained their trust in his story after he himself had acknowledged its falsehood. Of late years little or nothing had been heard of him, and it was only the announcement of his death that revived a flash of interest in his extraordinary career. Perhaps the strangest part of the whole strange story is the fact that Arthur Orton, the Claimant, did not bear the slightest resemblance to the young Tichborne who had disappeared in the wreck of the *Bella*. History runs over with accounts of audacious impostures belonging to all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, in which some man presents himself as the living representative of one believed to be dead. But in all such cases, except that of Arthur Orton, the impostor bears some physical resemblance to the man whom he ventures to personate, and can supply evidences which go far to deceive impartial inquirers and make them believers in his story. In many cases the whole attempt at deception is originally suggested by a personal resemblance and the impostor having come into the possession of secret evidences which furnish him with effective means for prevailing on human credulity.

In the case of Arthur Orton there was nothing of the kind. Roger Tichborne had had the ordinary education of an English gentleman, while Arthur Orton was singularly ignorant. He could

not speak a single sentence of grammatical English or pronounce half-a-dozen words after any fashion other than that belonging to the lowest class of London tradesmen. He was supposed to have received a University education; but during his trial he acknowledged himself unable to tell which was a page of Latin and which a page of Greek when the two texts were presented for his consideration. He excused himself by pleading that he had forgotten all his scholastic studies; but even the most careless and forgetful of students could hardly, after any length of time, forget that the Latin character is the same as the English and that the English text is no help to the reading of the Greek character. Yet it is certain—and this is the most wonderful part of the whole story—that Arthur Orton was believed by the mother of the late Sir Roger Tichborne to be her son, restored to her from shipwreck by the beneficent hand of Providence.

There were at the time numbers of educated persons all over the country who fully believed in the genuineness of Arthur Orton's statements. Sir Roger Tichborne was, according to the evidence of all who knew him, a very slender young man when last he was seen in England, and Arthur Orton, the Claimant, was prodigiously stout and heavy. But it was pointed out that there have been instances common enough in life of a man's becoming enormously overgrown and fat, who had been in his earlier years graceful and slender.

Again, Arthur Orton could not at first remember the name of his mother, and when pressed made a wrong guess at it. But then, one was told, the mother herself, whose name had been forgotten by her son, was convinced of his identity. Arthur Orton's manners, his believers argued, had grown rough and uncouth because of his wild companionships in Australia, and it was futile to tell them that the manners, the accent, and the language which he had acquired were those of a Cockney tradesman, and showed no kinship with the dialect of the Australian squatter. The general verdict of the unprejudiced public was that, however extraordinary might have been the audacity of the attempt at imposture, there was something still more extraordinary in the unmeaning and incurable credulity of those who believed in the impostor. One can imagine such a story as his finding easy believers here and there if it were told by one whose attractive presence and engaging ways might prepossess in his favour those who saw him and heard him. There would be something captivating in the narrative of this marvellous restoration to home and friends of the gallant young heir who had been so long lamented. But here was a man whose appearance, whose every word, whose every attempt at coherent explanation combined to give the lie to his whole story. The death of Arthur Orton deserves to be recorded in history.

An old-time figure, in the truest sense of the

word, passed out of English public life when Spencer Horatio Walpole died, on the 22nd of May, at his house in Ealing, where he had passed his later years in almost absolute retirement. Spencer Walpole, who came of the historic family of Sir Robert Walpole, began his career as an advocate at the bar. He had, however, a liking for political life ; he was elected as a representative of Midhurst in 1846, and took his seat in the House of Commons as an out-and-out Conservative. He first made himself conspicuous in Parliament as an unflinching opponent of secular education, and he upheld with energy the now almost forgotten Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, a measure intended as a counterblast to Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral, which was supposed to threaten the invasion of Protestant England by the Church of Rome. Walpole was also a steady opponent of any measure having for its object a relaxation of the disabilities imposed upon the Jews in England. He was an impressive speaker, although somewhat too solemn in manner. He became Home Secretary in Lord Derby's Administration of 1852, which lasted only a short time, and when Lord Derby returned to power in 1858 Walpole was again offered the conduct of the Home Office. He accepted the office very reluctantly, because he did not believe that Lord Derby was strong enough in his Conservative principles, and he had some dread that the new Government might be inclined to enter into a compromise with the advocates of

political reform. He retired from his place in the Administration in 1859, but in 1866 he again became Home Secretary in Lord Derby's third Administration. Then came a serious crisis in the history of the Reform movement, the event with which the political career of Spencer Walpole is destined to be mainly associated. That event was the closing of Hyde Park, by police authority, against the meetings of Reformers. The riot thus caused ended in the breaking down of the park rails and the struggle between the invading Reformers and the police. The story has already been told in the fourth volume of this History, where an account is given of the manner in which the Home Secretary received a deputation from the Reformers, and with his breaking into a burst of fervent tears when they assured him that they had no intention to violate the law and to wreck the constitution. Walpole soon after ceased, and once for all, to be Home Secretary; but he remained for many years a member of the House, for the most part an absolutely silent member, until he finally gave up Parliamentary life in 1882. From that time until his death he was little heard of by the outer public, but his political career had peculiarities about it which claim for him a place in this record.

The name of Lyon Playfair, whose death took place on the 29th of May 1898, would naturally be associated to a certain extent with those of men like Sir Richard Quain and Sir William Jenner,

for he too had been a leading influence in the hygienic improvements of his time. Playfair, however, was a Professor of Chemistry, and not a Professor of Medicine; and he combined, with scientific work, many occupations with which Quain and Jenner never had anything to do. The elders of the present generation remember him as a great and active authority on chemical discoveries and applications; but those whose memory does not go quite so far back would probably think of him only as an influential figure in the House of Commons. He was born at Meerut in India on May 21, 1819, and was the son of Dr. George Playfair, Inspector-General of Hospitals in Bengal. In his early youth he was sent to Scotland, partly because the climate of India does not favour the young whose parentage is European, and also in order that he might pursue his studies in the country to which his family belonged. He became afterwards a student of chemistry at University College, London, and later went to Guissen to study organic chemistry under Liebig, many of whose essays he translated into English. Playfair's devotion to chemistry showed itself for the most part in a practical form and in relation to the industrial business of life, and for some years he was engaged as the manager of a large calico printing fabric in Lancashire. In 1844 his usefulness as a practical chemist had become so well known that Sir Robert Peel appointed him member of a Commission instituted for the purpose of carrying on an

inquiry into the sanitary conditions of our large towns. When the great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace was opened in 1851, Playfair was made Special Commissioner in charge of the Department of Juries by whom the prizes were to be offered for success in the products of industrial skill. In all the other great Exhibitions of his time Dr. Playfair was actively engaged in similar functions; and he was made President of a Commission appointed in 1874 for the re-organisation of the Civil Service. Great part of his very active life was given up to work on various other Commissions, each charged with an inquiry into some question gravely concerning the public health.

In 1868 a sudden change took place in the career of the Professor of Chemistry. At the General Election of that year Lyon Playfair was returned to Parliament by the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews. He was elected in the Liberal interest, but it may be assumed that the Scottish Universities fixed their choice on him mainly because of the services he had rendered to the interests of practical science. Playfair was now forty-nine years of age, and does not appear to have shown, up to this time, any distinct capacity or predilection for Parliamentary life. There is a prevailing impression that no man can succeed in the House of Commons who enters it for the first time after he has passed his prime. It is certain, however, that Playfair made a decided success in the House. Not only was he

appointed to high office again and again, but he proved himself a most capable debater on all manner of subjects, and would have made a name even if he had been a member of Parliament only, and had never devoted himself to the business of practical science.

The first office Dr. Playfair held in a Government was that of Postmaster-General, and some few years later he was appointed Chairman of Ways and Means, a position which is in fact that of Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons. During his tenure of this office he had to preside over some of the most stormy scenes known to the Parliaments of that generation, when the Irish Party, then but small in numbers, was, under the leadership of Mr. Parnell, already carrying out its policy of determined and systematic obstruction. This must have been a new and strange experience, for which nothing in Playfair's previous career could have prepared him. Yet it was universally admitted that he accomplished his new duties with remarkable judgment, presence of mind, impartiality, and good temper. He put the rules of the House in force with unflinching resolve, but even those against whom the rules were most severely directed were ready to acknowledge that he showed no inclination to exercise undue severity or to go further in the work of repression than he was compelled to do by the responsibilities of his office. The Irish Nationalist members readily admitted that he had not strained his authority, that

he had always been conciliatory in tone, as well as dignified in manner, and had striven to avoid giving personal offence in the exercise of his somewhat arbitrary powers. He probably did not find the duties of such a position altogether congenial, and he resigned the office in 1883. He did not continue, during his Parliamentary career, to represent the Universities which had originally returned him to Parliament, but represented the southern division of Leeds at a later period. He was appointed Vice-President of the Council in 1885, and continued to sit in the House of Commons until his elevation to the peerage in 1892. When he withdrew into what may be called the retirement of the House of Lords, he gave up most of his time to his old pursuits, wrote many essays, and delivered many addresses on questions belonging to the domain of practical science, some of which were afterwards published in volumes, and he served on Commissions having to do with the improvement in the condition of the poor. A success like his, so varied in each of its departments, so practical and so complete, might almost be described as unique in the history of its time.

The day which saw the death of Lord Playfair saw also the death of Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, who had played a long and honourable part in public life. Sir Thomas Acland was an English country gentleman, who had a distinguished University career, and always showed a deep interest both in questions of education and in the conditions

of agriculture. He was first returned to Parliament as a Conservative. He was a man with an open mind and a progressive temperament, and he soon found it impossible for him to adhere to the doctrines of what was then regarded as Conservatism. On one occasion he had voted against an amendment brought forward by Charles Villiers, which amounted to an entire condemnation of the established duties on the importation of corn. But he found before long that the arguments in favour of Free Trade were too strong for him, and he gradually became a supporter of the policy of Sir Robert Peel. Gradually, too, he changed his political views on other subjects, and, describing himself for a while as a Liberal Conservative, he finally became a supporter of Mr. Gladstone. He supported Mr. Gladstone cordially, even in the proposal for the granting of Home Rule to Ireland. Sir Thomas Acland was one of Gladstone's most devoted friends, and his death followed very soon after that of the great statesman. All who knew Sir Thomas Dyke Acland admired and trusted him, and his memory will long be cherished in his native county.

On the 31st of May died Sir Robert Rawlinson, a man whose name will ever be honourably associated with the development of sanitary science in these countries. Rawlinson was born in Bristol in February 1810; was the son of a mason and builder, who carried on his business in a Lancashire town, where Robert Rawlinson began his life, as

a working stonemason. He soon, however, showed capacity for other than mere mechanical occupations, and when he was twenty-six years old he was fortunate enough to become engaged in the service of Robert Stephenson, by whom he was employed in the construction of a part of the London and North-Western main line of railway. In 1840 he was engaged by the Corporation of Liverpool as assistant surveyor, and in this capacity he first began to develop effectively his great natural gifts for the discovery and application of sanitary methods to the condition of large cities and towns. He was one of the great and practical professors of the business of sanitation in such places; and he soon proved that he could work out his methods even in places and under conditions which were absolutely new to him. Sickness and mortality began to prevail to an alarming extent among the British troops in the Crimea, and Rawlinson was sent out as a leading member of a Commission appointed to visit the scene of war at once, and adopt any measures which seemed needful for the removal of disease. Rawlinson and his companions found that a pure water supply, proper ventilation, and the introduction of a healthy dietary were the special requirements for the removal of disease. By the effective application of such systems the mortality in camp and hospitals was reduced from something enormous to a death-rate which would have been considered small in any ordinary community.

More lately still, when the American Civil War disturbed so completely the conditions of industry in Lancashire as to threaten the temporary extinction of some trades and a consequent famine among the operatives, Rawlinson was sent by the Government to see what could be done in order to avert such a disaster. The system he recommended may be regarded as one of the first applications in the modern history of this country of Government resources to the promotion of needed and healthful industrial works, in order to find occupation for the unemployed at the risk of the Government in the first instance and of the local corporations in the second place. Rawlinson's plans proved equal to the occasion, were entirely successful, involved no final loss to the Exchequer, and still remain an encouraging example for measures of a similar kind. In 1883 Rawlinson received a knighthood, and during all the later part of his life he took an active and a most beneficial part in all measures relating to the promotion of the public health.

The death of Samuel Plimsoll on the 3rd of June, at Folkestone, recalled the memories of a stirring and passionate agitation and a beneficent and successful career. Plimsoll, who died at the age of seventy-four, had been known for nearly a generation by the honourable title of the 'Sailor's Friend.' He was a Sheffield man by birth; was largely engaged in the coal trade; and from his boyhood took a deep interest in all movements for

improving the condition of the working classes. He acted as one of the honorary secretaries of the Crystal Palace Exhibition in 1851. A shipper of coals who was also a philanthropist would naturally have had his attention drawn to some of the conditions under which the British mercantile marine was doing its work, and under which the British mercantile seaman was commonly compelled to risk his health and his life. Plimsoll became filled with the idea that much suffering and much sacrifice were put upon the crews of a large portion of the mercantile marine by the unsuitable character of the ships—the “coffin ships,” as he called them—which many shipowners sent to sea; vessels which were at the same time overloaded and undermanned. Plimsoll was elected as a Liberal representative for Derby in 1868, and two years after he began his famous agitation in the House of Commons for the introduction of measures which should absolutely prevent the sending of unsuitable vessels to sea and the selfish and wanton risk of the seamen’s lives.

An earlier volume of this History tells the story of Plimsoll’s agitation for the improvement of the laws relating to merchant shipping, and of the extraordinary scene which took place in the House of Commons when he poured forth his passionate denunciations of those shippers who, for their own selfish gains, ‘sent sailors to their death,’ and the feeble Governments which hesitated to bring in properly restrictive legislation. Plimsoll then

indignantly left the House; but everybody in the House well knew that the last had not been heard of the agitation with which the impassioned philanthropist had threatened the accused shippers and all who lent them their support. Mr. Plimsoll made good his threats, and he undoubtedly aroused the attention of the country thoroughly to the deplorable state of things he had denounced and to the inadequacy of the measures which the Government then in office had suggested as its remedy. The public out of doors readily admitted that the philanthropist had in his zeal offended against the rules of the House of Commons; that he had been drawn into some exaggerations when describing the system he condemned; that he had even in certain instances made unfounded charges against companies and individuals. But the general opinion unquestionably was that he had proved the existence of a great public evil, with which legislation, though well able to cope, had up to his time made no adequate effort to abolish or abate. One of Plimsoll's main points was that the system which allowed shipowners to raise enormous insurances on any class of vessels held out a positive reward for the use of worthless craft and the consequent risk to the lives of seamen. Another was that there were no provisions made by law for the proper loading of merchant vessels. The general conviction forced upon the public was that he had at least made out a good case for the introduction of effective legislation on

both subjects. As the result of his agitation the principle of his 'load-line' was finally adopted by the Government and made part of the law, and other reforms in legislation bearing on the merchant shipping trade began to develop themselves. Much yet remains to be done; but it is beyond dispute that to Mr. Plimsoll belongs the credit of having been the first to awaken the attention of the whole country to an evil which had hitherto been allowed to pass almost unnoticed. His name will always hold an honoured place among the names of energetic, enthusiastic, and successful philanthropic reformers.

One of the most brilliant and at the same time one of the most steady lights of the world of art went out on June 17, 1898, when Edward Burne-Jones died at West Kensington in London. It is not too much to say that Burne-Jones exercised an influence over the art of the painter which has never been surpassed and can never wholly pass away. He began his career in a period peculiarly appropriate to that order of genius with which he had been endowed. He was born in Birmingham, a place the world does not associate naturally with imaginative art, and his father had formed plans for his future life having no relation to the career he was designed by nature to pursue. He was sent to Exeter College, Oxford, in order to receive an education which should prepare him for the life of a clergyman. But the mind of young Burne-

Jones was already possessed with visions of a different kind. His whole soul was filled with an enthusiasm for the artistic life, and his mind was that of a poet as well as of a painter. Much influence was exercised over his early choice of a profession by the friendship he formed at Oxford with William Morris. This was a period when that Renaissance, as we call it, of British art in poetry and painting was beginning to assert its influence. William Morris was one of the poets of that movement, and there was a natural affinity between the temperaments of the two young men.

Burne-Jones soon gave up all idea of seeking for holy orders. He left Oxford, and set out to seek his fortune in London. Through his friendship with Morris he became acquainted with the pre-Raphaelite leaders in painting and poetry, with Ford Madox Brown, who may be regarded as the earliest chief of the school among painters, with Dante Gabriel Rossetti, at once great poet and great painter, with Algernon Charles Swinburne, and most of the other men who were then beginning to command the attention of the world. For a long time Burne-Jones, who had now found his true path in life and was moving steadily along it, continued to be a painter in water-colours only. He showed, however, a marvellous vividness of colouring which gave to his water-colours all the strongest and brightest effects of an oil painting, and when, after several years, he became also a

painter in oils, he proved that he could hold his place with the greatest masters of the art. He never relied, as many famous painters have done, on mere skill and mastery in the execution of his works. By nature poet as well as painter, his genius showed itself first in its choice of a subject, and then in the power that converted it into a living picture. His paintings are poems or stories or allegories realised on canvas, and the gazer is for a while uncertain which takes the greater hold upon his mind, the imaginative power that conceived the subject or the artistic skill that wrought it into perfection as a picture. Burne-Jones had a keen sense of humour, which made him a most delightful companion in social life and prevented him from indulging in any of the mere extravagances common to audacious inventiveness. Some of his most successful work is displayed in the stained windows of great Cathedrals at home and abroad—in England, in Rome, and in the United States.

There is a famous French epigram about a great Frenchman, of whom it is humorously said that he never was anything—not even an Academician. Burne-Jones never was an Academician; that is to say, he never was a full member of the Royal Academy. In 1885 he was elected an Associate of the Academy, but the controllers of that institution never advanced him to any higher honour. Burne-Jones and his friends fully expected that as a matter of course his name would

come to be enrolled among the names of Royal Academicians. Seven years passed away without any such recognition of his genius, and it does not seem that even the proposal made to the patriarch of old days that he should work yet another seven years before obtaining his reward was offered to the English artist. Burne-Jones, acting with a natural and reasonable sense of the slight put upon him, withdrew his name from the list of Associates, and thus separated himself entirely from the Royal Academy. The world in general continued to recognise his genius more and more with every year, and the Royal Academicians might have applied to themselves a well-known saying, and declared that nothing was wanting to his glory and that he was wanting to theirs. The State did not follow the example of the Royal Academy and refuse to recognise the public claims of the great painter. Mr. Gladstone, who had a thorough appreciation of art in all its departments, and especially perhaps of that school of imaginative art which Burne-Jones represented, recommended that the Queen should bestow a baronetcy on the painter. Burne-Jones, it was said at the time, was at first reluctant to accept any title; but it was urged upon him that it would seem ungracious to the Sovereign and to her Minister of State not to accept the offer in the spirit which prompted it. He withdrew his objection, and became Sir Edward Burne-Jones.

There was throughout the country and throughout the world one common feeling of gratification when this Royal recognition of the great painter's place in art was made known. Burne-Jones had never, during the whole of his career, made the slightest effort to obtain what is called social distinction. He had never sought after aristocratic society or regarded it as an honour to be entertained in the houses of the nobility. But he had never adopted the ways of the hermit, he always loved genial companionship; and if he liked a man he liked him for his personal qualities, and not either because he was or was not accepted in high society. Burne-Jones was not given to the ways of the bustling world whether of business or of fashion, and no one could have enjoyed more thoroughly than he a life of seclusion in some beautiful lake-land or woodland region. But he had nothing in his whole nature of the misanthrope, and we can hardly think of him as enjoying the life of a recluse remote from the friends whom he loved, the libraries and picture galleries which were familiar to him, and the frequent interchange of artistic suggestions and humorous fantasies in which he delighted. If Burne-Jones liked a man we may be sure that while he would not have liked him any the less because the man was only a struggling painter, he would not have made it a point to keep out of his range because the man happened to be a millionaire or a peer.

In the same sense we may take it for granted that as Burne-Jones never sought to be made a baronet, so when he had consented to accept the title he saw no reason to become apologetic for what he had done. The influence of Edward Burne-Jones over the world of art was unsurpassed by that of any other painter born into the nineteenth century, and will remain an influence through all time.

On the 14th of July, Elizabeth Lynn Linton, one of the most active literary women of her time, died at the age of seventy-six. Mrs. Lynn Linton was in her way successful in every literary path on which she ventured. She wrote many novels, and was a frequent contributor to many of our leading periodicals. 'The Shrieking Sisterhood,' a phrase in constant use at one time among those who desired to cast ridicule upon the vehement, and occasionally rather strident, advocates of women's rights, was taken from the title of an article in the *Saturday Review* which was written by Mrs. Linton. Certainly few men of her day could bring into any controversy a more effective pen. She professed to be an advocate of steady-going, old-fashioned ideas and principles, and she strongly opposed the demands of many of her sisterhood for woman's equality with man in literary, artistic, and poetical competition. Yet it was often pointed out that she herself was a striking example of woman's capacity for giving man as good as he brought in any intellectual controversy.

Elizabeth Lynn Linton was, notwithstanding her acrid style in controversy, a kind-hearted and amiable woman, and a favourite in every society. She began her literary career with the encouragement of Savage Landor, and later on enjoyed the friendship of most of the leading authors and artists of her time. She was the daughter of the Rev. James Lynn, a country vicar, and she married William James Linton, who won celebrity during those days as a wood engraver, and afterwards went to the United States and settled there. His wife did not accompany him—indeed a sort of amicable separation was arranged between them—but Mrs. Lynn Linton helped her husband for a long time after in the care and education of his daughters by a former marriage. Before their separation, the artistic pair prepared together, and published, a volume descriptive of the English Lake Country, for which the husband made the illustrations and the wife supplied the literary descriptions. Mrs. Lynn Linton was one of the many novelists who go so near to full success as to give the hope that another really great author of fiction is rising, and yet, despite of much popularity, fail to win a place in the foremost rank.

The death of Helen Faucit, on October 31, withdrew from the life of the English drama a figure which had been most picturesque and most popular in its bright and many days of success. Her whole career on the stage was not very long, for she was born on the 11th October 1820, and

after her marriage, in 1851, to Sir Theodore Martin, the distinguished ballad writer, translator, and biographer, she withdrew from the stage altogether. Helen Faucit took the leading part in Macready's Shakespearian revivals, in many of Bulwer Lytton's plays, in Browning's 'Blot on the Scutcheon,' and other famous dramas. She was not an actress of passionate and thrilling dramatic power; she did not in that sense even endeavour to be a rival of Mrs. Siddons, or of Miss Cushman who belonged to her own time. Her especial characteristics were the expression of delicate and tender feeling, of sweet and poetic emotion, of pathos, and of refined and graceful humour. She seldom attempted any part which did not lie quite within the range of her own artistic inclinations and capacity, and therefore, in the parts which she made especially her own, she was without a rival during her career as an actress. Although her chief success was won by her in some of Shakespeare's plays, yet she never willingly appeared in any of the Shakespearian parts which called for the realisation of overwhelming passion or of despair. Nothing is more truly artistic than that self-knowledge which teaches a performer to understand fully his or her own capacity, and not to strain after uncongenial experiments. Helen Faucit made the very best of her really great qualities as an actress, and her name will ever have a place of honour in the history of the British stage. After she had withdrawn into private life, she

delighted the public by some fascinating essays on Shakespeare's woman characters. She also appeared from time to time as a performer on behalf of organisations for raising funds for the benefit of charitable institutions connected with the dramatic profession. Up to the last she was able to display all the captivating qualities of her earlier days. She enjoyed the companionship and the friendship of many of the most gifted men and women in the various regions of art. She died on October 31, 1898, in the vale of Llangollen, in Wales, which had been for some time a favourite summer resort of her and her husband.

On December 10, 1898, William Black closed at Brighton a literary career which will always be remembered in the history of fiction. It was not a very long career, for Black was born in 1841, and had not settled down to his work as a novel-writer until 1868. William Black was born in Glasgow, of Highland origin, and the finest works he ever produced were steeped in the poetic atmosphere of his native land. His earliest inclinations as he grew towards manhood were for painting, and he studied for some time with that object in the art schools of his native city. But, although he was a highly imaginative youth, he had in his mental composition a good share of that common sense which is generally held to be characteristic of his countrymen. He saw that nature had not intended him to be a painter, and when once this truth had been borne in upon his mind he acted

resolutely and promptly, and sought for more promising occupation. He turned his attention to journalism, and succeeded in obtaining a position on the literary staff of a Glasgow weekly paper. The sphere, however, was too narrow for his capacity, and he resolved to seek work in London. He came up to London, and lived in lodgings with Robert Buchanan, who had gone there a few years earlier, accompanied by David Gray, the poet, who died young. Black, after being for a short time in a city counting-house, obtained an engagement on the editorial staff of the *Morning Star*, and wrote many brilliant literary articles which made it clear to his friends that he was capable of still higher achievements in the world of letters. During the war between Prussia and Austria he acted as special correspondent for the *Morning Star*, and met with the curious adventure of being mistaken for a combatant, captured, and for a while held a prisoner by the Prussians. William Black's novel, "Love or Marriage," was published in 1869, and he followed this with two others, in rather rapid succession. These three novels did not make any distinct success. They were fairly well spoken of by most of the critics, but they did not suggest to the reviewers or the public at large that a new and brilliant light was coming up in literature. Black saw clearly that his success thus far had not been equal to his aspirations; but he felt at the same time that he had not put his best work into these first

attempts, and he was convinced that he had in him the capacity for work of a higher kind. Here again he acted with the quiet common sense that was a part of his nature. Fully assured in his own mind that he could give to the world a novel which the world would accept, he believed that it might be a disadvantage to him if he were to publish his next novel in his own name, and thus lead critics and readers alike to expect nothing but mediocrity. In 1871 he published anonymously 'A Daughter of Heth,' and with the publication of that novel his complete success was assured. The critics and the reading public took to him at once. The authorship of the book did not long remain a secret—and, indeed, there was no further motive for desiring to keep it a secret, for Black had already realised his ambition. There is a famous saying of Edmund Kean, who, when somebody told him how certain great personages had admired his first appearance as Shylock in a London theatre, vehemently replied that he cared little what the great personages thought—'the pit rose at me.' The pit, and the stalls, the gallery, and the great personages all rose at Black's 'Daughter of Heth.' He had nothing then to do but go on writing the best novels he could with full confidence that they would be thoroughly appreciated by the public. Black did, in fact, create a new school of Scottish novel-writing, and it may be doubted whether any Scottish novelist has more effectively illustrated the charms of

Scottish scenery. Black also dealt with many scenes and characters which were not Scottish, and he could always work out happy and picturesque effects. His death was early, but he had won his fame.

An eminent member of the medical profession whose life came to an end within this year was Sir William Jenner, who died on the 11th of December 1898. Jenner was born on 30th January 1815, at Chatham. His birth, like that of Sir Richard Quain, was lowly. His father was the owner of a small inn, and Jenner, like Quain, received his earliest education at a local dame's school. He showed from his boyish years a strong inclination for the study of medicine, and in 1833 was sent to University College, London, to obtain a medical education. After he had entered the medical profession his upward movement became rapid, and he was soon acknowledged as one of the rising men in the sphere which he had chosen. He became Professor of Clinical Medicine to University College in 1857; in 1861 he was appointed Physician-Extraordinary to the Queen, and in 1863 he became Physician-in-Ordinary to the Prince of Wales, now King Edward VIIth. He was created a Baronet in 1868, and may be said to have received all the distinctions appropriate to his services and his success which could have been given to him by recognised authorities abroad as well as at home. He attended the late Prince Consort during the fatal illness which left Her Majesty a widow;

attended the Duke of Albany during the many illnesses which ended in his death; was mainly instrumental in saving the life of the Prince of Wales during the dangerous malady which befell him in 1872. Queen Victoria had the utmost reliance on his abilities and his care, and often expressed in words of warmest cordiality her grateful sense of the services he had rendered to her family, and her sincere friendship for him. Sir William Jenner has been described by many of his friends as a man who never formed an undecided or doubtful judgment on any subject concerning which he was called upon to make up his mind. When he saw his way, he saw it quite clearly, and could not be led from it. His emphatic decisiveness is said to have often alarmed those who had to consult him, and who could not at first accept fully and unreservedly his decision. He appears even to have had in him something of that relish for the contradiction of opinions expressed by others, which Herbert Spencer frankly acknowledges to have been one of his own peculiarities. But those who derived benefit from Sir William Jenner's knowledge, skill, and care could well excuse in him the positiveness with which, when his mind was made up, he overbore all counsels that tended to oppose his decrees. Sir William Jenner's was, indeed, a remarkable career, and it is gratifying to know that it was well rewarded.

CHAPTER XII.

PEACE CLAIMS HER VICTORIES.

THE establishment of the Peace Conference at the Hague in 1898 is an event which has hardly as yet realised the promise with which it was announced ; but it may none the less, despite of all discouragement and all prediction of failure, come to be regarded as the opening of a new and most happy era in the history of the world. The Peace Conference was opened at the Hague in 1899, but it was invited at the end of August in the preceding year. The Conference was the conception of the Czar of Russia, the Sovereign of the Power that had long been regarded by most of the world's civilised States as one of the great disturbers of human peace. The ideas and proposals of the Czar were made known to the world on the 24th of August 1898, by Count Muravieff, Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Imperial Court of Russia. His momentous despatch began with the declaration that 'The maintenance of universal peace, and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations in the present condition of

affairs all over the world, represent the ideal aims towards which the efforts of all Governments ought to be directed.' Then Count Muravieff went on to tell the various Foreign Offices, and through them civilisation in general, that such was the view which absolutely corresponded with the humanitarian and magnanimous intentions of his Imperial master. He was magnanimous enough to say that the Government of Russia felt convinced that the same high purpose agreed with the interests and the legitimate requirements of all the Powers, and that the present moment was especially favourable for seeking by way of international discussion 'the most effective means of assuring for all peoples the blessings of real and lasting peace, and of fixing a limit to the progressive development of existing armaments.'

Count Muravieff passed on to tell his readers that during the previous twenty years aspirations after general peace had grown particularly strong in the consciences of civilised nations; that the preservation of peace had been made the aim of international policy, and that for the sake of peace the Great Powers had been forming strong alliances. Among the readers of the despatch there may well have been at the time a considerable proportion who believed they had good reason to know that the alliances between Great Powers had been formed more often for the purpose of carrying on successful wars than establishing a reign of universal peace. Without pausing to consider this particular ques-

tion, every one must have agreed with Count Muravieff when he declared that all these efforts 'have not yet led to the beneficent results of the desired pacification.' One paragraph in this despatch dwelt with great force and justice on the fact that 'the ever increasing financial burdens attacked public prosperity at its very roots.' 'The physical and intellectual strength of the people, labour and capital, are diverted for the greater part from their natural application and wasted unproductively.' Then came a consideration which is impressing itself more and more every year on all minds open to enlightenment, and has never before impressed itself so much and so hideously as it is doing at the present day, that 'hundreds of millions are spent to obtain frightful weapons of destruction which, while being regarded to-day as the latest inventions of science, are destined to-morrow to be rendered obsolete by some new discovery.'

But what had the Russian Sovereign to suggest as a practical means of encountering these terrible evils, and accomplishing over them the victory of international peace? The Russian despatch suggested that it was the supreme duty of all States just then to put some distinct limit to those unceasing armaments; and, "impressed by this feeling, his Majesty has been pleased to command me to propose to all Governments accredited to the Imperial Court the meeting of a Conference to discuss this grave problem.' Such a Conference, Count Muravieff said, 'would, with God's help, be

a happy augury for the opening century,' 'would powerfully concentrate the efforts of all States which sincerely wished to see the triumph of the grand idea of universal peace over the elements of trouble and discord, and would at the same time bind their agreement by the principles of law and equity which support the security of States and the welfares of peoples.'

The issue of this invitation to the civilised powers of the world created at first almost a sensation of bewilderment. The question on the lips of most in the outer world was whether such a proposal could be seriously and sincerely meant, and, if so, what hope the Czar could have of any practical good to come from its announcement at such a time. The Czar, it was pointed out, had only quite lately been increasing his own armaments, and was thus regarded as the most formidable and threatening enemy of England in her Indian Empire. Here, it was said, is an apostle, if not the apostle of war, suddenly preaching peace. Was the whole project merely intended to draw forth a refusal from some of the great European Powers, and thus to throw on them the discredit of having denied even a hearing to the proposals for peace, and by that denial to justify the Czar in returning to Russia's old-time policy of war and conquest? Yet it had to be borne in mind that, so far as the Western world of Europe could judge of the Czar's temperament and character, it was generally understood that he was somewhat of a

dreamer, who found it congenial to indulge in hopeful visions of a regenerated world which he might help to create. It might also be remembered that the very necessity, or supposed necessity, for the increase of his armaments and the maintenance and enlargement of the bulwarks guarding his new possessions, might of themselves have impressed the mind of the Czar with a keener appreciation of the state of things which was driving Europe on and on to increasing rivalry of warlike preparations.

It was not possible to reject such a proposition under these conditions, and the States invited to attend the Conference all very sensibly announced their intention to accept the Czar's invitation, and to go into council with him as to the possibility of preventing the increase of armaments, of trying to found an international court of arbitration, and making at all events a seemly show of doing their utmost to introduce the reign of universal peace. Perhaps the representatives of the invited Powers were quite willing to express themselves in the most liberal terms with regard to the reign of universal peace. That was a subject on which benignant platitudes might be expressed without any inconvenience to the practical arrangements for the armies and navies that each individual State might believe it was bound for its own interest to maintain. But there was a strong impression at the time when the invitation was accepted that the reduction of the armaments would be found the most troublesome part of the

business ; that to talk of peace was harmless amusement, but that to propose the restriction of armaments was quite another matter. It was now settled, however, that the Conference was really to meet, and to undertake in some fashion or other the work proposed for it. The understanding was that the Conference should sit not in the capital of one of the Great Powers, but in that of a smaller State, and the historic Hague was aptly chosen as the fitting seat for such a meeting.

The opening of the Conference took place on the 18th May 1899. It might be justly described as a representative assembly of all the civilised States in the world. Great Britain, Russia, France, the United States, Austria and Hungary, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Turkey, Greece, Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Holland, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Bulgaria, Servia, and Montenegro were represented there. China, Japan, and Siam were also represented. Every State, in fact, which professed to be at once civilised and settled would seem to have sent its representative to the Hague. M. de Staal, the Russian Ambassador in London, was chosen as President of the Conference. At an early stage of the proceedings it was decided that the subjects of discussion should be divided into three separate orders, and that these should be the question of disarmament, the establishment of certain principles of humanity to govern the making of war, and the principle of arbitration to be tried before

any of the States represented at the Conference should engage in the work of war. It was also agreed that naval and military armaments should be treated as one subject where the business of the Conference was concerned.

Around the first subject of debate, as might easily be anticipated, the most serious difficulties arose at the very opening of the Conference. How is it to be decided whether the armaments of this or that State are really too large for the positive necessity of the State's defence, and that this or that State is unduly taxed for the maintenance of its war material and its war forces? This question was brought up at once in very distinct form by the representative of the German State, Colonel von Schwartzhoff. The German delegate insisted that the German peoples were not overburdened in any sense by the load of their military armaments, and he denied that they were being dragged or were drifting towards national exhaustion by their efforts to maintain their position among the States of Europe. Now it was certain that towards this same point the strongest objections would turn at once from all the States desiring to maintain great armaments and to foster a policy of aggression and conquest. It is certain also that Germany was not one of the States which had an especial turn towards a policy of aggression, or could plead any fair excuse even if it had been so inclined for a policy of conquest. But for that very reason those who at the Conference represented the

old ideas must have been especially gratified to find that the German representative had raised the first important objection to the suggestion of an international agreement for the reduction of armies and navies.

The German case was from its very nature plausible and effective. The German system, which made military training a part of every man's duty, just as school education was a part of every youth's upbringing, removed many of the most serious objections which the intelligence of the world was beginning to see to the extravagant military preparations of so many European States. The German representative went on to show that the States constituting the Germanic Empire had been steadily improving of late years in every form of national prosperity. He did not perhaps feel it any part of his duty to dwell upon the fact that the improved prosperity had been due in great measure to that strengthening and consolidating of the Empire which enabled her for the first time in modern history to feel free from any dread of foreign invasion, and saved her from the necessity of keeping her armies always in condition to resist it at a moment's notice. The case of Germany, if fully and fairly considered, might have been regarded as one of the strongest arguments in favour of just such an international system as that which the Conference had been invited to consider. At the cost of many great wars and vast sacrifices Germany had been

enabled to secure herself against foreign invasion and foreign conquest, and now Germany was by a curious application of argument put forward as an example of the wisdom of letting things go on as they had been going before. The Commission, or Committee, to whom this armament question was referred, adopted unanimously what we may regard as a somewhat evasive recommendation—perhaps the only sort of recommendation which under the peculiar condition of the time was likely to be sustained by the Conference. The Commission considered first that it would be very difficult to determine, even for a period of five years, the figure of effective forces without regulating at the same time the other elements affecting national defence; secondly, that it would be no less difficult to regulate by an international commission the elements of that defence as organised and required in each country; and thirdly, that the restrictions of the military burthens, which at present weigh heavily on the world, is greatly to be desired for the material and moral welfare of humanity. This was the only kind of agreement which the combined and compromising consciences of the diplomats could then see their way to adopt. The diplomatic representatives of the civilised world began by pointing out the immense difficulties in the way of any international agreement as to the reduction or even the restriction of armies and navies, and then brought themselves into something like harmony with the views of the

philanthropists by declaring that it would be a very good thing for the world if some such regulations could only become a matter of universal agreement.

The humanitarian question, that which was involved in the ever-increasing employment of torturing and death-dealing explosives, brought out much difference of opinion. Many arguments were used to show that an improvement in the craft of rapid destruction might after all tend to the service of humanity, inasmuch as it might bring each particular war to a more rapid close, and thus allow the contesting States to get back to peace at an earlier period than otherwise. The Conference came to an understanding that entire freedom to employ new forms of gunpowder must be regarded as one of the rights of States. A large majority at the Conference declared that no reason had been shown for the States to pledge themselves against the adoption of any new inventions in the art of dealing death on the battle-field. The Swiss representative proposed that the Conference should recommend the prohibition of explosive bullets, such as the dum-dum bullet, in warfare, and this proposal was supported by the Dutch delegate, himself a military man. The Austrian representative opposed this motion, and urged that it would be enough to prohibit the use of bullets that caused unnecessary and cruel mutilation, and this suggestion had the support of the British representative, Sir John Ardagh. Those who knew

Sir John Ardagh must have known perfectly well that he was not a man likely to sanction the practice of unnecessary cruelty in the business of war; but it must be seen that it would be difficult indeed to establish any definite rule as to the sort of bullet which ought to be condemned because of the unnecessary pain and mutilation it caused, and to lay down the law that the pain and mutilation occasioned by favoured and sanctioned explosives was absolutely indispensable if the business of killing were to be carried on at all.

The result of the deliberations was that a motion was carried which condemned the use of bullets that expand in the human body. Probably this was about as far as any Conference, representing such a variety of States and of races engaged in frequent war, would be likely to agree upon. The whole discussion on this particular question might well have produced amusing commentary from a philosopher of the days of Rabelais, or the days of Swift, if such a philosopher could have been present at the deliberations, or could have been furnished with a report of the debate. He might have inquired whether it was really much better to be killed by a bullet which did not expand in one's inside, than by a bullet which accompanied its death-dealing puncture by a simultaneous process of expansion. Would the victim be likely to know at the time whether the bullet did or did not expand—could he summon his faculties about him just then so clearly as to make up his mind whether

it was more agreeable to die by the one bullet than by the other? Even such a philosopher would, no doubt, have readily admitted that the addition of deliberate and protracted torture to the work of war must make that odious work more odious than ever. But he might none the less have devised many whimsical illustrations as to whether there is really much to be said in favour of the humanity which kills in a second when compared with the inhumanity which occupies two seconds in completing the operation.

This is one of the evil characteristics of the whole trade of war with which the Hague Conference found itself every now and then disagreeably confronted. One can quite understand any devotion of humane feeling given to the mitigation of suffering among the wounded, who are the necessary victims of every battle, but when it comes to be a question whether some particular bullet, supposed to be the most effective for the work of slaughter, is or is not a second or two slower in its operation than some other, it seems as if humanity itself might sicken over the discussion. Each side engaged in the battle has for its ultimate purpose to kill the largest number it can of the enemy's men. That is what war is meant for. The advocates of the latest invented and most deadly explosive might fairly contend, on behalf of his favourite bullet, that it brings the war to an end more quickly than any other, and ought therefore to be regarded by humanity

as furthering the interests of peace. Again, it is quite apparent, that unless the Conference could secure a thoroughly unanimous condemnation of a particular explosive, the only result would be to give the dissenting States a decided advantage in war over those which had, for the sake of humanity, accepted the condemnation, and pledged themselves to act upon it. The whole subject is so full of horrors, that we can well understand the difficulty felt by the Conference in coming to any stringent resolution. 'Let us leave the name of the Lord out of the business,' is the cry in 'Faust,' when an appeal is made to the Divine Being at a crisis in man's conflicting passions. 'Let us leave humanity out of the business,' might have been the thought of many a representative at the Hague Conference when the discussion was going on as to the comparative amount of agony which this or that bullet might inflict in its rapid death-stroke.

Then came the great question of international arbitration. This was the question of surpassing importance which the Conference had to discuss, and the subject, too, which could be most effectively decided by a general and final agreement. Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British representative, brought forward a proposal which went to the very heart of the subject. He introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a permanent Committee of International Arbitration, before which disputing States would have to submit their rival claims, and

to whose decision and advice it would be their duty to listen, ere yet they took any steps for the enforcement of their demands. This proposition was finally adopted in substance, and in that adoption is to be found the historical value of the whole Conference. A series of resolutions was agreed upon, and embodied in a document, which was described as 'A Convention for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts.' One of these articles declared that the signatory Powers 'agree that, in case of grave disagreement or conflict, before appealing to arms, they will have recourse, so far as circumstances allow it, to the good offices or mediation of one or more of the friendly Powers.' Another article set forth that 'the signatory Powers consider it useful that one or more Powers that are not concerned in the conflict should offer of their own initiative, so far as the circumstances lend themselves to it, their good offices or their mediation to the disputing States,' and 'the Powers not concerned in the conflict have the right of offering their good offices or their mediation even during the course of hostilities,' and that 'The exercise of this right can never be considered by either of the disputing parties as an unfriendly act.' Then the proposed agreement went on to define the duties of the mediating Powers. 'The part of the mediator consists in the reconciliation of contrary pretensions, and in the allaying of the resentments which may be caused between the disputing States.' The

duties of the mediator were to come to an end from the moment when it was announced, whether by one of the disputing parties or by the mediator himself, that the basis of a friendly understanding proposed by him had not been accepted.

One significant and very important article in the proposed Convention declared that 'Good offices and mediation, whether recourse is had to them by one of the disputing parties, or on the initiative of Powers not concerned in the conflict, have exclusively the character of counsel, and are devoid of any obligatory force.' It was even provided that the acceptance of mediation was not to have the effect, unless an actual agreement were made to the contrary, of interrupting or delaying in any way the preparation of the measures considered necessary in the event of war, and that if the mediation should intervene before the opening of hostilities, it was not, unless by special agreement, to interrupt the military operations then going on. The representatives of the Conference also thought it well to put on record some articles providing for and recommending the application of a special form of mediation in certain instances. One of these recommendations was that, in the case of a grave disagreement which seemed to threaten war, the disputing States should each choose one Power to which they might entrust the mission of entering into direct communication with the Power chosen by the other side for coming to a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

The article provided that, during the continuance of such an arrangement, the question in dispute was understood to be reserved exclusively for the two chosen Powers, who must apply all their efforts for the time to the settlement of that controversy. It was further suggested that the duration of the mandate should not, unless the contrary had been specially stipulated, exceed thirty days. This was not in itself a stipulation of cardinal importance, although, of course, it was well that some limitation of time should be suggested.

A much more important provision was one declaring that, in case of the actual rupture of pacific relations, the two Powers, charged as already described with the effort at a peaceful settlement, should still remain entrusted 'with the common mission of profiting by every opportunity of re-establishing peace.' It was also stipulated that, where any differences of opinion should arise between the Powers which had signed an agreement, with regard to questions of fact creating a disagreement which could not be settled by the ordinary diplomatic methods, and in which neither the honour nor the vital interests of these Powers were at stake, the disputants were to agree to have recourse to the institution of the International Commission of Inquiry in order to clear up all questions of fact by an impartial and careful investigation on the spot. The report of this Commission of Inquiry was not to have the character of an arbitrating decision. The disputing Powers

were to be left free, either to conclude a friendly agreement on the basis of the Commission's report, or to leave the whole question, including the significance of the report, to the decision of the general international tribunal. It was provided that the agreement to arbitrate might be made for the settlement of disputes already going on, or for disputes which might be regarded as impending, and there was to be no limitation as to the nature of the disputes, provided that they were actually international, and such as must, in the ordinary course of things, be either settled by some process of agreement, or submitted to the arbitration of war. Furthermore, it was stipulated that 'the arbitral Convention involves an engagement to submit in good faith to the arbitral decision.' The Powers signing the treaty reserved to themselves the liberty to conclude 'new agreements, general or particular, with the object of extending compulsory arbitration to all cases which they judge capable of being submitted to it.'

Then came the arrangements as to the practical working out of the system of arbitration, which the Conference was about to establish. It was agreed that a permanent court of arbitration, accessible at all times in conformity with the rules of procedure set forth by the Conference, should be established at once. An international department was to be founded at the Hague, and placed under the direction of a permanent official staff, and this office was to be the medium for all communications

dealing with the meetings of the arbitrating court. Each of the signatory Powers was to designate, within three months after the ratification of the Conference's decision, four persons considered by each Power as possessing ample qualifications for dealing with questions of international law, and recognised as of high character by their countrymen. These persons thus nominated were to be placed on the list of members of the arbitrating court, and every subsequent alteration in that list of members must be brought by the central offices under the consideration of all the Powers which had signed the international agreement. The members of the court were to be appointed for a term of six years, and any appointment might be renewed if it were thought desirable by an agreement of the signing Powers. The international tribunal was to sit usually at the Hague, but it was to have the right to sit elsewhere if such an arrangement were thought desirable, and with the consent of the States engaged in the dispute.

There was also a provision of much importance to the effect that every Power, even although not a signatory of the general act of agreement, could apply to the court for the benefit of its arbitration under the conditions laid down by the present Convention. It was agreed that a permanent council, composed of the diplomatic representatives of the signatory Powers resident at the Hague, was to be constituted in that city, to be

presided over by the Dutch Minister for Foreign Affairs, and that this council was to be charged with establishing and organising the international offices, which were to remain under its direction and its control. This council was to decide all questions which might arise as to the effective working of the international tribunal, and was to have absolute powers as to the nomination, suspension, or dismissal of the functionaries employed in the central offices. The presence of five members at meetings duly convoked was to enable the council to carry on its deliberations and come to its decisions, and decisions were to be taken by a majority of votes. There were many other provisions with regard to the formation and the practical business of the arbitration tribunal into which it is not necessary to enter.

The great result of the whole Conference, so far as its work of arbitration was concerned, proclaimed itself to be the foundation of a court ever open at the Hague for the peaceful settlement of all disputes arising among the Powers which had signed the treaty, or even between States which had never taken part in the Conference, but which, nevertheless, had themselves expressed a desire to have the question at issue decided by the international tribunal. Here then was an entirely new and, to all appearance, an absolutely beneficent principle introduced into the government of the world's political affairs. There was to be a tribunal founded and maintained by all the great States and most

of the smaller States in the civilised world for the sole purpose of settling by peaceful arbitration quarrels that might arise between any of the governments of countries, even of countries which had not taken any part in the scheme for the constitution of such a tribunal. No scheme like this had ever before in history been agreed upon by the world's great ruling States, or had even been considered by them as capable of serious and practical discussion with a view to the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This, it might well have been believed by enthusiasts, was the opening of an entirely new and most beneficent era in the direction of human affairs. The time when the Conference agreed upon its scheme was not indeed, to all appearance, very propitious for the inauguration of a world-wide reign of peace. But it has happened more than once before in modern history that some event which was hailed with almost universal acclamation as fraught with unspeakable benefit to the cause of peace, and designed to help in bringing about such a benignant result, has been followed, as if through the perverse caprice of fate, by a sudden and prolonged season of warlike struggle here, there, and almost everywhere.

Many readers of this volume can remember the hopeful and gladdening anticipations which were formed of the results sought for and likely to be accomplished by the founding of the first Universal Exhibition, that which the year 1851 saw opened

in Hyde Park. Poets wrote thrilling lyrics foretelling its services to the cause of peace and international amity. Prophetic hymns were chanted in Churches to launch it with the blessings of Christian faith. Emperors, Kings, and Queens entered into friendly rivalry in extolling its purposes. Statesmen and orators hailed it as the advent of an era of peace and international good will. Yet it so happened that the time of that great first exhibition was quickly followed by a long, unusually severe, and calamitous epoch of wars. We had the Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny, the war between France and Austria, the struggles in Italy, the Civil War in the United States, the invasion of the Mexican Republic by Napoleon III., the war between France and Prussia, the fall of the French Empire, and the terrors of the Commune. Yet it would be unreasonable to insist that because of the strange coincidence that all these wars followed so quickly the opening of what was supposed to be a reign of peace, the establishment of great international exhibitions has done nothing to help towards the friendly and humanising intercourse of nation with nation in the work of industrial progress. We must not allow ourselves to be too much discouraged by the fact that the Conference at the Hague was followed by some years of terrible warfare carried on in different parts of the world. England had to go through a long period of exhausting war. Russia herself, from whose ruler came the invitation

to a Conference for the establishment of a peaceful international tribunal, has been engaged in war of the most formidable and exhausting character that ever distracted her since she had to maintain herself against the armies of the first Napoleon.

An entirely new event in the story of modern war has come up for the bewilderment of the world; the East, so long invaded by the West, has inverted the order of things, and taken on herself the invasion of the West, and has shown energies, resources, and capacities for the struggle which the West never could have dreamed she possessed, which seem fraught with limitless possibilities of disturbance for the future. It is not surprising if, under such conditions, the international Conference established at the Hague should have found that thus far it had but little work of arbitration with which to occupy its spare time. The most sanguine believer in its beneficent effects could hardly have expected that England would submit the settlement of the South African dispute to the arbitration of the Conference. Nor could any confident hope have been felt by any enthusiast that Russia and Japan would have invited the Conference to settle the dispute as to their rival claims to certain territories and sea-ports which, as a matter of fact, belonged to neither of them. Yet where the fullest allowance has been made for the feelings of profound and inevitable disappointment, it is not too much to say that the establishment of the international tribunal at the

Hague may prove to be a measure of invaluable importance towards the founding of an era when great wars shall be only the ultimate resort and not the instant and unqualified resolve of ambitious rulers and aggressive States. Something has been done which never was done before. The great majority of the world's rulers and States have solemnly declared it as their opinion that international disputes of whatever kind ought to be referred to the examination and decision of a court of inquiry in which all civilisation is represented before they are committed to the arbitrament of war. The States whose representatives have signed their names to that agreement may be expected, when the convulsions of the present time have settled into tranquillity, once again to remember that they did actually make themselves responsible to the world and to history for a proclamation declaring that it is the duty of civilised men to seek a peaceful settlement of international disputes before venturing on trials of warlike strength, and that they provided a permanent tribunal for the peaceful settlement of such controversies.

The very wars which have been going on since the Hague Tribunal opened its doors to the world may of themselves, by a natural course of reaction, help to bring the minds and moods of nations to the resolve that at least the experiment of peaceful arbitration must have a fair trial before men plunge into another series

of wars. The first powerful State which sets such an example will have conferred a blessing on mankind hardly less memorable than that which we must all hope has been given to humanity by the founding of the international tribunal itself. It would not be possible to overrate the beneficent influence which some one of the great European States might confer upon the world by taking such a step. There will be an interval of uncertainty, an interval of doubt, during which men do not know whether the Hague Conference has not already got out of date, and whether the Great Powers which called it into being have not convinced themselves that they never could have taken it seriously, and that the less said about it the better. Then if some great European Power, happening to come into controversy with a rival State, should suddenly proclaim its willingness to submit the whole question to the Hague Tribunal, the instant result might be to convert that tribunal into a recognised and working institution for ever. The great State which is the first to take this step may decide by that single movement the fate of the Hague Tribunal.

A second Convention was held to deal with the laws and practices of war on land, and then a third to consider what could be done in order to bring the practices of naval warfare into better conformity with the humane principles laid down by the famous Geneva Convention. The Hague representatives also agreed upon the issue of

recommendations forbidding the throwing of projectiles or explosives from balloons, and the use of certain kinds of explosive bullets. Then the Conference agreed to issue a series of resolutions which had been foreshadowed in the programme offered by Russia in the original appeal by which the Conference was called together, but which the representatives assembled there found it not possible to embody in definite and final agreement with the unanimous approval of the representatives. One of these recommendations merely expressed the conviction that some limitation, if possible, to the enormous military charges at present weighing upon the world was greatly to be desired for the material and moral welfare of humanity. This resolution even the most old-fashioned and warlike of States might well have accepted without hesitation, but it left the world without any practical guidance as to the manner in which such limitation was to be accomplished. Another pious wish was that a Conference should be called at some future time—‘at an early date,’ it was suggested—in order to define the rights and duties of neutrals. Yet another resolution expressed a wish that the rules of the Geneva Convention should be subjected to early revision in order to make its authority more effective than ever in the service of humanity. Finally, the Conference agreed unanimously, except for the absence of a small number of members, that the principle of the inviolability of private property in war at sea, and that a proposal regulating and

limiting the practice of the bombardment of ports and seaside towns and villages by a naval force should be made the subject of full consideration and agreement by the future Conference to be assembled for that special purpose.

Such was, in fact, the whole of the work done or projected at the Hague during its initiative Conventions. The resolutions thus issued by the representatives of all the Great Powers went to establish an international tribunal for the peaceful settlement, where possible, of disputes between States; to the adoption of some regulations which might, where war became inevitable, do something to diminish its cruelties and its horrors; and to discourage the practice of turning scientific and mechanical skill to making these cruelties and horrors more and more rapidly and widely destructive.

Nothing would be more easy than to disparage the effect of the work achieved by the Hague Convention, to argue that it had only succeeded in issuing a number of platonic appeals to the better feelings of human nature such as might have been agreed upon at any period of the world's history by a number of enlightened and philosophic personages assembled for the better instruction of mankind and of mankind's rulers. It would also be easy to argue, and the argument might find support from the events of later days, that the rulers of most of the States represented at the Conference had no particular inclination

to put themselves out of their way for the beneficent purpose of carrying on the system recommended to their approval. So, too, it might be contended that the utter disregard shown by all the signatory Powers for the existence of the Hague Tribunal when questions of dispute arose among them almost immediately after, and have continued to arise ever since, is in itself almost conclusive evidence that none of them regarded its establishment then, or regard it now, as anything having the slightest practical interest for statesmanship. It is certain that the world's international dealings have thus far been carried on after just the same fashion since the foundation of the Hague Tribunal as before its creation. The first record that an ordinary reader can find of an international dispute settled by the Hague Tribunal is that of a question arising between the United States and Mexico, which resulted in an order by the Tribunal that Mexico should pay to the United States 1,420,682 dollars, and should also pay the annual sum of 43,051 dollars. The details of the question at issue are not of any importance to the purpose of this narrative, and the subject is only introduced here because the author has not come upon any other record of an international dispute settled by this peaceful award.

Here, indeed, is another illustration of the New World coming in to redress the balance of the Old. If the example set by the United States and Mexico should have any effect in arousing the

consciences of the great European Powers to the duty of showing themselves sincere votaries of the principle they have themselves established, authorised, and proclaimed, then the New World will have done something to repay the benefit which the Old World conferred by the discovery of America. We are free to indulge a hope that before long, and in quieter times, the Old World may begin to remember that it did establish the Hague Tribunal, with the object of giving international disputes a full opportunity of peaceful settlement before the rude arbitrament of armies and navies is called in to give its verdict, as it must for the most part do, on the side of the stronger, and will find that it is its duty not to apostatise from its own united profession of faith. We cannot but think that the awakened conscience of the West will before long take this form of expression—an event of immeasurable importance to the progress of enlightenment, civilisation, justice, and humanity in the history of the world. That such an event should come from the inspiration of a Russian ruler might seem to us of the present day something like a paradox in history; but as we have high poetic authority for believing that the path of safety for a great Trojan hero once came through a Grecian city, we may be encouraged in the hope that the path of the world to the practice of peaceful arbitration may be found under the guidance even of a Russian autocrat.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SESSION OF 1899.

THE opening of Parliament on February 7, 1899, had been preceded by a political campaign of much interest and importance throughout the constituencies. The delivered speeches were of peculiar interest just at that time, because every one knew that there were distracting influences at work among the Liberals, and that new shades of opinion were beginning to appear even among the Conservatives themselves. The Liberal party had come under a new leadership. When Sir William Harcourt had announced his resolve not to hold the leadership any longer, the Liberals had, as we have seen, found, after much discussion, that they could do nothing better than elect Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to the vacated place. It was well known throughout the country that this was not the spontaneous and cordial choice made by the members of a party who are convinced that they have got the right man for the right place, and with whom his election is a work of unanimous enthusiasm. Even among the leaders of the

Liberal party there were now some men who, if they did not actually renounce their faith in Home Rule for Ireland, were inclined to put the whole question aside for the time and not to give it an opportunity of leading to disputes in the party. Before the opening of the Session more than one influential member of the Opposition had on a public platform declared his belief that Home Rule had ceased to be a question of immediate interest, and that even Ireland herself had other legislative claims which she would do well to consider as more pressing and practical. Imperialism, too, was a subject on which the Liberals had not come, and were not likely to come, into agreement. Mr. John Morley devoted some of his most earnest and powerful speeches during the recess to a denunciation of Imperialism and its ways, while, on the other hand, some of the most rising of the younger men in the party had occasionally indulged of late in the glorifying of Imperialism after a fashion which might have justified hostile critics in describing them as Jingoës. There were differences of opinion, too, among the Conservatives, but nobody supposed that these differences of opinion would be likely to affect, just then, the existence of the Conservative Government while the Liberal party was about to enter on an entirely fresh chapter of its existence under the experimental guidance of a new leader.

The differences among the Liberal party were made evident and were defined clearly enough by

the speeches of Mr. John Morley, of Mr. Asquith, and Sir Edward Grey, while Mr. Arthur Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain in their speeches already suggested, though as yet but vaguely, the coming of that serious controversy which was destined before long to agitate the Ministerial side of the House of Commons. To that side, too, belonged some younger and rising men whose public addresses were beginning to mark them out as very independent supporters, if they ought not rather to be described as very independent critics, of Lord Salisbury's Administration. One of these was Lord Hugh Cecil, son of the Prime Minister. Lord Hugh had begun to take a highly independent part in the House of Commons with regard to religious questions and the manner in which these were affected by existing laws. He had already made himself a distinct influence in the House, and seemed to be bent upon creating a party of his own to act with him on the questions in which he took an especial interest. Another was Mr. Winston Churchill, who still occupied a seat on the Ministerial side of the House, but was beginning to make it clear that he could not be regarded as likely to remain contented with that position for very long. Winston Churchill was the son of the late Lord Randolph Churchill, and by his remarkable and ready eloquence, his peculiar individuality and his independence, which sometimes seemed like eccentricity, recalled to the memory of many in the House the brilliant characteristics

of his distinguished father. The differences of opinion which thus began to show themselves among those who sat on the Ministerial side of the House were not yet at least regarded by many inside the House or outside it as calculated to create any serious difficulties for the Ministry, while it was apparent to every one that the breaking of the Liberals into separate sections must have a very decided effect on the prospects of the party at the next General Election. On the whole, the recess now drawing to a close was a period of much interest and animation for the public in general, and the opening of Parliament was looked forward to with a keen and peculiar anxiety.

The Session was opened by commission, and the Speech from the throne was read by the Lord Chancellor. The Royal Speech opened with the usual assurances that England's relations with foreign Powers continued to be friendly. It then passed on to speak of the expedition against the Dervishes, resulting in the fall of Omdurman, and to pay a tribute to the brilliant ability of Sir Herbert Kitchener and the officers serving under him, and 'to acknowledge the distinguished bravery and conduct of the British and Egyptian troops which have won this victory.' There followed some satisfactory assurances as to the restoration of peace and order resulting in the island of Crete from the establishment there of a civilised Government, at the head of which was Prince George of Greece. The invitation offered

by the Emperor of Russia for a Conference at the Hague was mentioned, and the Queen declared that 'I have gladly signified my willingness to take part in its deliberation.' The assassination of the Empress of Austria was deplored. The calamities caused in some of the West Indian colonies by hurricane, by the plague in parts of the Indian Empire, and the efforts made to relieve the troubles caused by these two visitations were also mentioned. Then came that part of the Speech which told of the measures about to be submitted to Parliament during the Session. These included 'a measure for the establishment of a board for the administration of primary, secondary, and technical education in England and Wales,' for encouraging agricultural and technical education in Ireland, and for other purposes of a like practical character. There was nothing in the Royal Speech which seemed to indicate that any debates involving grave and critical controversy were likely to be brought under the notice of Parliament during the Session. There was a general feeling within and outside the Houses of Parliament that the Government were not inclined to pledge themselves just then to any measures certain to provoke serious dispute, and at the same time that the condition of the Liberal party did not give the Opposition much hope of being able to force the Government into a resolute course of action with regard to some important legislation. Therefore, when the Address in reply to the Speech from the

throne came to be moved in both Houses, the members of each House felt curious and even wondering interest as to the subject which could succeed in arousing a genuine stir of emotion, and as to the side by which such a topic was likely to be brought up.

Lord Kimberley in the House of Lords accomplished what may be called his official task by entering into a survey of the Government's policy in the East, more especially in the Soudan; but although his criticism was that of a recognised political opponent, he does not seem to have gone so far as to provoke the majority in the House of Lords to regard him as a Little Englander. The Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, replied to the leader of Opposition, and kept himself entirely to those questions of foreign policy which Lord Kimberley had opened up. Some of these criticisms Lord Salisbury pronounced to be 'hypercritical.' The debate touched on the condition of China, and on the arrangements believed to have been made between Great Britain and Germany in the interests of either Power in South-Eastern Africa. The debate followed the usual destiny of formal debates in the House of Lords, and came to an end without disturbing the mind of any one. Nothing was said about any of the announcements made as to domestic legislation, and the Address was placidly adopted without a division.

In the House of Commons there was, as may readily be supposed, more animation and more

emphatic difference of opinion. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman made, at an early part of the discussion, his first appearance as leader of the Opposition. He found some fault with the want of interest and of sympathy which the Government had displayed in their manner of accepting the invitation of the Russian Emperor to the Peace Conference, and also, with the insufficient description which, he contended, had been given of the domestic measures about to be introduced by the Government. Mr. Balfour, in reply, said that no time had been lost in sending an answer to Russia's invitation, and maintained that the answer was expressed in terms of sincere sympathy. Then followed, as usual in the House of Commons, a number of amendments to the Address, calling attention to omissions or defects in the announced proposals of the Government for the Session, and over the debates on these subjects no less than ten sittings were occupied. Much complaint was made by critics in the press about the amount of time alleged to be wasted in these discussions, but it was said on the other side that the opportunities for the raising of grievances by private members during the debates on the estimates had been much restricted by recent regulations, and that some of the greatest improvements made in domestic legislation had been originated through the medium of discussions which at the time might have seemed desultory and inappropriate. There was much discussion as to foreign policy, especially

where the East and the Far East were concerned, and the crisis then going on in the Church of England brought up a very animated and vigorous debate. This subject is dealt with in another part of the volume, and we need not enter into it here.

An amendment which led to an important debate was that proposed by Mr. E. J. C. Morton expressing regret that no measure dealing with the ownership and taxation of land in towns, and the consequent escape of ground landlords from local taxation, had been promised by the Government. Mr. Asquith represented the front Opposition bench in the support which he gave to this amendment. He contended that larger compulsory powers of acquisition ought to be given to local authorities, and that local rating should be so reformed as to make it impossible for an owner to withhold land from public use. Mr. Asquith declared that such remedies as these could not be described as inconsistent with the soundest principles of political economy or the elementary rules of justice. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Goschen defended the general course taken by the Government on this subject, but only defended it on the grounds that under all the very difficult conditions they had done the best they could thus far and hoped to be able to do better in the coming time. The division taken on this amendment showed that with all their powerful majority the Government were able to win only a very doubtful victory over

the advocates of bolder legislation in the same direction, for the amendment was defeated by 157 votes to 123, a majority of 34. Some of the grievances of Wales with regard to the condition of agriculture were strongly set forth by Welsh members, and their demands for fresh and distinct legislation were championed by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. But it was urged on behalf of the Government that some of the remedies suggested could only be brought about by the making and passing of special laws for Wales, and that unless under very peculiar circumstances it was not desirable that Parliament should recognise the principle of separate legislation for the Welsh part of the kingdom. This is the usual official reply which has been made again and again to any demand that the grievances of one nationality, forming a part of the United Kingdom, should be dealt with by legislation applying to that part of the country alone, an argument which often stood for a long time in the way of reforms now recognised as necessary and wholesome and tending directly and permanently to the real union of Great Britain and Ireland. The amendment therefore was rapidly got through, and only a comparatively small number of members took part in the division. One hundred and ninety-four votes were given against the amendment, and only 144 members supported it.

The House was then invited by Mr. Labouchere

to consider the necessity of restricting in some practical way the powers of the House of Lords. This question, as was but natural, interested most members of the Commons more deeply than any appeal on the subject of Welsh agriculture would be likely to do, but even on this exciting subject the House did not find itself overcrowded when the division came to be taken. Mr. Labouchere's amendment proposed that the House of Lords should be allowed once to reject a Bill passed by the House of Commons, but that if after such a rejection the same Bill were to be passed unaltered by the House of Commons in the following Session, it should then forthwith become the law of the land. The amendment seems to have somewhat embarrassed all but the more advanced members of the Liberal Opposition. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman urged one practical objection to Mr. Labouchere's proposal, the objection that it would invest the Sovereign with an entirely new constitutional power by enabling her to give the final Royal assent to a measure which had been passed by only one Parliamentary chamber. The leader of the Opposition declared that he desired to have the Lords' power of veto regulated and restricted according to some principle unlike to that prevailing at the time. But even this he seemed to desire because he believed that the manner in which the Lords now exercised their power would probably at some moment of great political crisis lead to a disturbance that

might be dangerous to the State. While resolved to uphold the rights of the representative chamber against the encroachments of the hereditary legislators, he stated that he was willing to leave to the Peers a sufficient share of the constitutional powers that had been theirs for centuries. The speech might be regarded as careful, moderate, and conciliatory if coming from some member who did not quite know whether to describe himself as a very moderate Liberal or a rather advanced Tory; but as delivered by the new leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons it had a somewhat damping and dispiriting effect on most of his followers.

Mr. Balfour, who spoke on behalf of the Government, came no nearer to antique Toryism than Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had come to advanced Radicalism. He found fault with Mr. Labouchere's proposition on the ground that it would place everything, including the nation itself, at the mercy of the House of Commons, as it would enable the Commons at some serious crisis to pass a measure by their own vote without any appeal to a General Election. Mr. Balfour also pleaded for the House of Lords on the ground that it had often done the State good service by rejecting measures that were never brought forward again and by delaying measures for which public opinion was not yet ripe. Mr. Balfour made a plea on behalf of the House of Lords which at a former day would not have

been accepted with much gratitude by some leaders of the hereditary chamber. He insisted that the House of Lords had always shown itself amenable to public opinion and would never long resist any project of reform for which the people in general continued to call. This was hardly the character which the leading spirits of the House of Lords were themselves accustomed to claim for that assembly. The ruling virtue asserted for the House of Lords by its hereditary champions used to be that its mission was to teach the country the true gospel of political salvation and to save it from the encroachments and invasions of ignorant democracy. The numbers taken on the division illustrated, in a certain sense, the moderate and almost unconcerned tone of the leader of the House on the one side and the leader of the Opposition on the other. Only 223 Conservative members went into the lobby to vote for the maintenance of what their political faith is supposed to regard as the mainstay of the British Constitution, while but 105 democrats presented themselves in the other lobby for the purpose of emancipating the cause of reform from the domination of the hereditary legislators.

Then the grievances of the Scottish crofters were brought forward, but were not allowed to occupy very much time; for the Government made some vague promises, and it did not appear as if much could be accomplished by a prolonged discus-

sion. An amendment was then brought forward of a decidedly embarrassing character so far as the holders of Ministerial office were concerned, an amendment involving a principle which was to call up serious and important discussion in subsequent Sessions. This was embodied in a resolution proposed by an Irish Nationalist member, Mr. Swift MacNeill, declaring that 25 out of the 44 present Ministers of the Crown held among them no less than 41 directorships in public companies, and that the union of such offices was calculated to lower the dignity of public life. The debate on this amendment occupied the greater part of two sittings. The ordinary observer might have thought that the statement contained in Mr. MacNeill's resolution expressed nothing more than a moral platitude, and merely affirmed that a man who held office under the Crown and thereby was supposed to possess the full confidence of the Sovereign, who had to see that the financial affairs of the country were managed with regard only for the common good of all, ought not to be, at the same time, engaged in making money for himself out of the directorship of private companies which might, for ought anybody could say to the contrary, be now and then increasing their dividends at the expense of some national interest. It was certain, however, from the opening of the debate, and was certain even before the debate had been opened, that no immediate practical result could come from such an amendment, and that no considerable number

of Ministerial supporters could possibly be found to vote for it.

The proposer of the amendment knew perfectly well, we may be sure, that his proposal must be overwhelmed by votes against it if it were pressed to a division, but his object, no doubt, was to bring the public opinion of the country to bear more strongly on a practice which was growing to be a serious public scandal, and this result he certainly accomplished. Of late years a strong feeling had been growing up everywhere in the country against the system which allowed Ministers of the Crown receiving salaries from the public money to endeavour to make fortunes by engaging in the management of private companies which might at any time set themselves to do a good stroke of business by some enterprise more or less directly inconsistent with the national interests. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, himself a man of great Parliamentary and financial capacity and of the most unblemished personal integrity, opposed the amendment in a speech which he must have considered it one of the formal duties of his position to deliver, a speech which sometimes made listeners feel a doubt whether he was not really all the time amusing himself by an elaborate satirical performance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer maintained that Ministers of the Crown were just as free as other persons to occupy their leisure in such other occupations as were congenial with

their tastes and habits. We may be allowed to vary and multiply the illustrations of his argument. Why should not a Minister of the Crown, although drawing a salary from the public funds, devote his leisure to the writing of books and add to his income by that occupation? Was there anything scandalous in Mr. Disraeli writing novels and taking payment from the publishers for them while he was also receiving his salary as a Minister of the Crown? Did not Mr. Gladstone, while holding office in the Government, write and publish volumes for which he received some pecuniary recompense from his publishers? Did not the first Lord Lytton, while holding office under the Crown, spend some part of his well-earned holidays in writing plays which were to be put upon the stage and liberally rewarded by grateful managers? There are understood to be cases in which Ministers of the Crown spent most of their unofficial time in cultivating flower gardens, in attending horse-races, even in games of golf, and no advanced democrat in the House of Commons ever brought forward a proposal to restrict such Ministers in their extra-official occupation. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach might at once have replied to these arguments that the Ministers in these latter cases were not making any money by their pastimes, and that the instances therefore had nothing to do with the argument; but those who supported Mr. MacNeill's motion in the House of Commons would be obviously

entitled to say that what they condemned was not the practice which allowed men holding Ministerial office to amuse themselves according to their own tastes or even to add to their own income by literary or other honourable work during their unofficial hours.

The object of Mr. MacNeill's resolution was direct and obvious, and was not affected in the slightest degree by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's argument. Its purpose was to prevent Ministers of the Crown from engaging in the directorship of public companies which might at any moment be concerned in enterprises prejudicial to the public welfare and tempting to dishonest speculation. The whole history of financial speculation had for some generations been lavish in illustrations of such enterprises and the disasters which they had brought upon the community. Could it be anything but injurious to the credit of the Government and Parliament that a Minister of the Crown, however honourable his private character and pure his personal purpose, should be induced to take part in the management of one such speculative company and to have his name and credit involved in its breakdown, its exposure, and the widespread calamity it had brought about? Sir Michael Hicks-Beach protested with much indignation against the idea that all joint stock companies were dishonest speculations and that all their directors were corrupt. The indignation would have been superfluous in any case. If any one had said

that all joint stock enterprises were dishonest and all their directors corrupt it would not have been worth while to show much anger in replying to so absurd and senseless a statement, but as a matter of fact nobody had said anything of the kind in the debate on the Address. What was said there, and was said out of the House every day, was that joint stock enterprise had of late been greatly overdone; that many dishonest transactions had taken place; that many scandals had been brought to light, and that it would be much better in every sense that Ministers of the Crown should not be allowed to give the influence and the attraction of their names to private speculations which must, in the very nature of things, be open to such possibilities.

Mr. Balfour supported the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but his argument belonged rather to the school of philosophy than to the business of the House of Commons. The leader of the House maintained that the security and integrity of public life were to be found rather in Parliamentary precedent and in enlightened public opinion than in precise rules applied only to one set of persons. Nothing could be said against this as a general principle, but it did not help the House very much to get over difficulties which might arise when certain practices, still sanctioned by the rules of Parliament, had been found to lead to public scandal. The recognised moral laws of right and wrong ought to be the best guarantee as to the

conduct of men engaged in public life ; but it has always been found necessary, even in the House of Commons, to lay down distinct rules regulating the conduct of all servants of the Crown in Parliament and out of it. Mr. Asquith, who made a very effective speech in the debate, reminded the Government that the system which the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the leader of the House were defending was, in two of its principles at least, distinctly inconsistent with the traditional rules long established for the regulation of Administrative positions—one rule that a man who held office under the Crown should devote his whole business capacity to that service, and another rule that no such man should place himself in a position where his public and private interests might come into actual collision. Mr. Asquith reminded the House that in Mr. Gladstone's latest Ministry this last rule had been maintained and strictly acted upon, and that its abandonment or relaxation when the Conservatives came into power had already been severely commented upon in the House of Commons.

It must have been well known to everybody that severe comments had been made from time to time by public speakers and newspaper critics on the use which was habitually made of the name of this or that particular member of the Administration, although not of the Cabinet, to promote the fortunes of certain public companies in which these men had held positions as directors. Nothing

definite came of the debate; but it was quite evident that the subject would not be allowed to pass out of public notice, but must come up again and again until some satisfactory settlement should be obtained.

The question of Home Rule was brought before the House by Mr. John Redmond, at this time the leader of only a small section of the Irish Nationalist party. The conditions under which it was brought up were therefore somewhat peculiar, and the motive for bringing it forward just then was readily apparent to the House. Every one understood that a man of Mr. Redmond's ability and practical experience did not propose an amendment calling for legislative independence for Ireland in order merely to have an opportunity of delivering a speech to be reported in the Irish newspapers, and that he did not suppose the occasion was favourable for extorting concessions to the Home Rule principle from the Administration then in power. Mr. Redmond's amendment was evidently directed not as a means of testing the Government, but as a means of testing the Opposition on the principle of Home Rule. What he wanted to know was how far the leaders of Opposition had fallen away from the position which had been resolutely maintained by Mr. Gladstone, and from the policy which under Mr. Gladstone's lead had succeeded in passing a measure of Home Rule through the House of Commons. We have already described

the changes of opinion on the subject of Home Rule among the leading men of the Liberal Opposition since Mr. Gladstone's death. Sir William Harcourt had now ceased to be leader of the Liberals, and Mr. John Morley had withdrawn from an active share in the guidance of the party. These changes had left the Irish members without any certainty that the leaders of the Opposition could now be regarded as champions of Home Rule.

The speech of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman could have left little doubt on the mind of Mr. Redmond that the front Opposition bench was not for the time prepared to maintain the principle of Home Rule for Ireland in the spirit which prevailed during the days of Gladstone, and Harcourt, and Morley. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman declared that while the Liberal party remained the only party in the House which supported the principle of self-government for Ireland, they claimed for themselves the right to say when and in what way they were to put that principle into actual application. The members of the Liberal Opposition, their leader said, were practical men, and they could not give a promise that Home Rule for Ireland was to be the first subject with which they must deal on their return to administrative power, or make any definite promise as to the time when a Liberal Administration could undertake to deal with the question. He assured the House that there was no formal alliance between

the Liberal party and the Irish Nationalist representatives, but that the 'alliance, in the sense of sympathy and the desire to co-operate, was as strong at that moment as it had ever been.' Furthermore, he told the House that according to his judgment an Irish National Parliament must be a subordinate and not an independent body. If Mr. Redmond's motive in raising the discussion was to prove to his party and to his country that they had not much to expect from the Liberal Opposition, as at present constituted, he must certainly have been well satisfied with the result of his attempt. The leading members of the Government in the House of Commons evidently regarded the discussion as no business of theirs, and merely as an affair concerning the relations between the Irish Home Rulers and the leaders of the Liberal Opposition. None rose from the Ministerial bench to intervene in the discussion, while, on the Opposition side, Sir Henry Fowler and Mr. Haldane gave their support to the definitions of Liberal policy set forth by their leader. The division did not show any intensity of interest, on the part of Conservatives or Liberals, in the whole question. Three hundred votes were given against Mr. Redmond's amendment, and forty-three Nationalist votes in its support. It may be doubted whether there was any one member either on the Ministerial, or on the Opposition side of the House, who really believed that the debate and the division had consigned Home Rule to the

kingdom of shadows. It may also be doubted whether any member of the Home Rule party felt much dismayed for the prospects of his cause by the result of the division and the change in the attitude of the Liberal Opposition, or was shaken in his belief that the votes of the Home Rulers would come to be a matter of serious consideration with the next set of Liberal statesmen who might come into office.

Another important question, having to do with the state of Ireland, was raised by Mr. Davitt. Mr. Davitt charged the Government with having done nothing practical to relieve the great distress existing in the West of Ireland. He was supported in his attack on the Administration by Mr. William O'Brien and other Irish members. It was made clear beyond question that there was an unusual and exceptional amount of distress then existing in the West of Ireland, and the complaint of Mr. Davitt and his supporters was that the Government were doing nothing to bring about a better condition of things. This better condition, he maintained, could easily be brought about if Dublin Castle would only pay attention to some of the proposed remedies. One of these remedies was a scheme of migration to lands compulsorily purchased by the Congested Districts Board. The reply made on behalf of the Government was of the old familiar order. The Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, Mr. Gerald Balfour, urged, first, that the distress in the West of Ireland was

not so great as Irish members had endeavoured to make out; then that the proposed remedy could not be carried out without extreme difficulty because the Irish people were so unwilling to leave their homes, wherever these homes might be, and to go into new habitations, even though the new habitations might still be in the old country. This seemed a curious argument to use at a time when the population of Ireland was decreasing, year by year, to an alarming extent, because the Irish peasant found that he must either starve or seek a home across the Atlantic. Is it really to be believed, some of the Irish members asked, that the Irish agricultural tenant would spend his last coin in paying for a passage across the ocean for the sake of obtaining the means of living, and that he could not be prevailed upon to remove to a home in his own island with the same object? Then the Irish Secretary brought forward the argument familiar in all such debates. He insisted that the real object in the minds of those who brought on these questions was not so much to benefit the peasantry of the West of Ireland as to keep alive or to revive the destructive agitation fomented by the Land League. The Irish Secretary went so far on the way towards conciliation as to assure the House that the Government had been doing, and would do, all that could be accomplished, with the means at their disposal, to facilitate every judicious and practical measure for the improvement of

the condition of the population in Western Ireland.

It should be said that the whole discussion arose out of an amendment brought on by Mr. Field, an Irish member, for the purchase and control by the State of the Irish railways, an amendment to which the Government offered a strong opposition, on the ground that Ireland was about the least suitable part of the kingdom in which the first experiment at State ownership of railways ought to be attempted by the ruling authorities. Mr. Field's amendment received but little support in the House, and was finally withdrawn by its mover, and therefore never came to a division. It has been thought well to mention it here, if only to show that the deep interest of the Irish National party was not to be aroused by merely speculative projects of reform, but was concentrated on the condition of suffering then prevailing in certain parts of Ireland, and on the one great legislative reform which these men believed alone could enable Ireland to secure for her people a happy and prosperous settlement on their own soil. The debate on Mr. Davitt's amendment was carried on during a great part of the following day, and it was then rejected by 203 votes to 102. Except for the subjects already mentioned, the debate on the Address turned, for the most part, on foreign affairs, or at least on questions affecting the share and interest of England in these foreign

affairs. On the 21st of February the Address to the Crown was finally agreed upon without alteration.

The debate on the Address foreshadowed, distinctly enough, the questions which were mainly to occupy the attention of the House during the whole of the Session. The policy of the Government in Egypt and in China, the relations of England with great European States having or claiming to have interests in those countries and in India, the state of the British Army and Navy, and the condition of either service for maintaining itself in the event of a possible war, gave the Government and the Houses of Parliament ample subject for discussion. Though some keen debates arose on purely British affairs, the time of the House was not engrossed by any great projects of reform relating to the domestic welfare of Her Majesty's subjects in the British Islands. The Budget introduced by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Chancellor of the Exchequer, could not be described as marking an era in England's financial history, or even as giving occasion for any memorable debate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had to deal with many increasing demands on the income of the country, and the increase in some of these demands was due altogether to the Imperialistic spirit and the consequent outcry for a stronger Army and Navy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to create some new stamp duties, and to increase in several

instances the duty on imported wines. The Budget scheme could not be said to enjoy an enthusiastic welcome, even from those on the Ministerial side of the House, and was met with much sharp criticism from the benches of Opposition. Except for the new duties which have been mentioned, the only important announcement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that his policy for making both ends meet included a proposal which amounted to a temporary suspension of the Sinking Fund. The Budget scheme was adopted without any serious alteration, and the most animated passages in the discussions which it brought forth consisted in the vigorous interchange of argument between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sir William Harcourt, one of the most brilliant and successful of his predecessors in office.

The Government took the earliest opportunity of introducing the promised measure for the municipal rearrangement of the metropolis. On the 23rd of February, Mr. Balfour introduced the London Government Bill. He seemed anxious not to allow the House to exaggerate the scope or overrate the importance of the measure, and spoke as if he were rather desirous to allay alarm than to encourage too much hope. The Bill, he explained, was merely intended to complete the edifice of local self-government in the metropolitan area, and he took care to assure the House that the organisation of the City of London, with all

its charters and privileges, was to remain untouched by the measure. The London County Council established in 1888 was to be left to deal with arrangements in which all parts of the metropolis had a common interest. The new measure was intended to deal exclusively with the vestries and other administrative boards created by the legislation of 1855, and it proposed to divide these into separate areas for local self-government. The measure had, for its main object, to convert the whole of the metropolis, with all its various municipal institutions and arrangements, into a number of separate and independent local councils, each entrusted with the full management of the constituency which it represented. No area, unless it contained a population of above 100,000 and under 400,000 inhabitants, was to be made a separate municipality. The object of the Government was that no municipality should be either too small or too large. Each of the municipalities was to have a Mayor, Aldermen, and Councillors, and the Aldermen were to bear the same proportion in number to the Councillors as in the provinces; the office of Alderman or Councillor was to be held for the same period as that allotted all through the country, and the elections were to take place in November instead of in May. The duties at present performed by the Vestries, the Districts Boards, the Baths and Wash-house Commissioners, the Libraries, and the Burial Boards, were all to be transferred to the governing bodies

of the new municipalities. These new municipalities could promote or oppose Bills in Parliament subject to the usual regulations. The projected reconstruction of London's municipal and parochial affairs would require every ratepayer to pay his various municipal rates in answer to the call of one demand note, that note having to set forth clearly each separate purpose to which the money was to be applied and each separate amount demanded. Each municipality would have only one rating authority. An order in council was to fix the number of Aldermen and Councillors in the new municipalities, and every municipality was to be divided into wards settled by order in council.

The modest manner in which Mr. Balfour had introduced the measure would seem to have harmonised remarkably well with the impression which the measure produced upon the House. The general idea was that the Bill did very well so far as it went, but that it did not go nearly far enough for such a work as the reconstruction of the municipal arrangements which had hitherto been governing the largest city in the world, a city with a population equal to that of some independent European States. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman criticised the measure in a tone rather of disparagement than of strong opposition, and the best thing Mr. Leonard Courtney had to say for the Government's scheme was that he hoped it might be regarded as merely

the prelude to something of far greater importance.

The second reading of the Bill opened on March 21. Mr. Herbert Gladstone criticised many of the details of the measure, and expressed a strong apprehension that the Bill, while disturbing in almost every part the existing condition of London's municipal arrangements, showed no signs of simplifying or completing it. The debate on the second reading lasted for some days, and among those who took part in it were Mr. Asquith, Sir R. Finlay, Solicitor-General, Sir Edward Clarke, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. John Burns, and Sir John Lubbock. The great difficulty with which the measure had to deal was the reconciliation of ancient civic traditions with modern municipal demands. The City of London and the Lord Mayor had claims, 'Greater Westminster' had its claims also, the old Parochial Institutions were not slow to assert their claims, and at the same time the population of the whole vast area known to the world as London had a good right to insist, and were strenuously insisting, that their wants must be taken into account, and that municipal government must be brought up to the level of modern improvements and modern demands. It would have been obviously difficult for any Administration to reconcile all these various claims, and equally difficult to create a really symmetrical system of London local government which did not interfere with at least some

of them. An amendment proposed by Mr. Herbert Gladstone, which only affected some of the arrangements of the Bill, was rejected by 245 to 118 votes, and the Opposition then allowed the second reading to pass, while announcing their resolve to reserve their further objections until the Bill should come into Committee.

The Committee stage of the Bill occupied the greater part of twelve sittings during its discussion in the House of Commons. One of the most keenly contested questions in the debate was that which referred to the admission of women to hold office as Aldermen or Councillors in the reconstituted London. We have been made quite familiar of late years with the arguments on both sides of every proposition to remove the old-fashioned restrictions which shut out women from taking part in municipal, parochial, and political functions. The fact that these restrictions were in steady process of removal did not in the least discourage the champions of the old ideas from bringing forward antiquated arguments during the discussion of each new proposal for reform. The case made out for the admission of women to a share in the rule of municipalities had been strongly supported by the manner in which they had already proved their capacity for the administration of the poor law. It had been already decided that the new municipal bodies should consist of Mayor, Aldermen, and Councillors, and thereupon the great question of the rights of

women came to the front. A metropolitan member proposed that no woman should be eligible for the position of Mayor, Alderman, or Councillor ; but this proposal seemed a little too much out of date even for a House with a Conservative Administration and it was rejected, although only by a majority of 127 to 101 votes. Another metropolitan member, eager to rescue some fragment of the old structure from the rising tide, put forward a resolution declaring the office of Mayor a position to which a woman could not be elected. Then the Committee became entangled in a rather absurd discussion on an amendment declaring that no woman could be an Alderman. The discussion seemed to convert itself occasionally into a sort of debate, partly grammatical, partly anatomical, as to whether a woman could, under any conditions, become an Alderman. The Committee, in fact, carried an amendment by 155 to 124 votes, declaring that the office of Alderman, as well as that of Mayor, was not to be open to the wearers of petticoats. The matter was not generally understood to have been settled at this stage of progress, and the common impression was that it, with some other disputed questions, such as that regulating the period of municipal elections, must be brought on again when the measure came up on report.

The report stage of the Bill was reached on June 6. Mr. Leonard Courtney proposed an amendment declaring that 'no person should be disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected an

Alderman or Councillor.' Many familiar arguments were used on both sides of the debate. The most forceable argument in favour of this was that women had for many years discharged admirably the duties of poor law guardians, and that some of these duties would now be performed by the borough councils. The proposal was carried by 196 to 161 votes. Lord Hugh Cecil soon turned the attention of the House to a very different and probably an entirely unexpected subject of debate. One clause of the Bill had provided that nothing in the measure was to transfer to a borough council any powers or duties of a vestry which had relation to the affairs of the State Church. The clause in question defined a vestry as elected from the inhabitants of the parish. Lord Hugh Cecil's amendment proposed to substitute for these words the words, 'such inhabitants of the parish as shall have obeyed that rubric of the Book of Common Prayer which is printed at the end of the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion, and which requires that every parishioner shall communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter is to be one.' Mr. Balfour could not see his way to accept this amendment, and even endeavoured to throw cold water on the sectarian fervour embodied in it. Mr. Balfour laid some stress upon the fact that if the revival of religious tests were to be made a subject of argument in the House, it had better be brought forward in some more definite and serious fashion, something more

distinctly inviting national discussion than as an amendment to one of the clauses in a measure for the reconstruction of London's municipal government. The amendment was withdrawn on June 8.

The opponents of women's suffrage still persevered in their objections, and when the third reading of the Bill was moved, on June 13, a motion was made by Mr. A. Elliot for the re-committal of the Bill in respect of the clause opening up to women the offices of Alderman and Councillor, on the somewhat absurd plea that the House was taken by surprise when such a concession was made to the champions of women's equality. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, recommended the mover of the amendment not to press it on the House, with the suggestion, which some took as serious and others took as humorous, that the House of Lords might be trusted to do all that could be desired in the repression of any unreasonable claims made on behalf of a new idea. Mr. Labouchere also urged that the best course would be 'to leave the Lords and the ladies to fight it out;' and the country soon found that the Lords were quite ready to do their best to resist any further advances on behalf of the emancipated ladies. Several noble Lords strongly opposed any concession to what one of them, the Earl of Dunraven, described as a sentimental cry for the equality of woman. Lord Salisbury spoke like a statesman and a man of thought on the

subject, and maintained that the services and experiences of women were as necessary for most of the duties which civic representatives had to perform as the services and experiences of men could be, and that the women who gave their attention to the needs of the working-classes came into closer touch with these subjects than the ordinary man could do. The Archbishop of York took a like view of the question, and told the Peers that, from his own experience as the Vicar of a London parish, he could bear testimony to the advantages of having the help of woman in municipal government. The Earl of Kimberley, leader of the Liberal Opposition, supported the views of the Prime Minister and the Archbishop. The Lord Chancellor took a resolute stand on the other side, and made it an especial cause of objection to the principle introduced by the House of Commons that it was only one further step in the direction of endowing women with a vote for the election of members of Parliament. The Duke of Devonshire took much the same view of the subject; and thus it will be seen that the question became no longer one of party, but created new division lines of its own. The clause in the Bill opening municipal offices to women was defeated by 182 against 68 votes.

The Bill, thus seriously altered, went back to the House of Commons, where Mr. Courtney proposed, as a compromise, that women might be chosen as Councillors, but not as Aldermen. Mr.

Balfour kept as much as possible away from discussion as to the abstract question or even the immediate and precise question of woman's rights, merely appealing to the House to consider whether it was advisable to wreck the passing of the whole measure, a measure which had so many supporters among all parties and sections in the House, because one particular clause in the Bill was meeting with an overmastering opposition in the House of Lords. The supporters of the Government appeared to be unanimously in agreement with Mr. Balfour on this subject, and were probably only too well pleased to have an opportunity of getting rid of the question of women's eligibility, for the time. The suggestion for surrender to the Lords was strongly opposed by Mr. Augustine Birrell, Mr. John Dillon, Mr. Channing, Mr. C. Scott, Mr. Spicer, and others, all of whom were willing to go so far in the way of compromise as to support Mr. Courtney's amendment. Mr. Labouchere still held to his well-known opinion as to the necessity for keeping women in what former days had regarded as their right places, and even declared that the Lords had, by their decision, really expressed the wishes of the majority in the House of Commons. This apparently startling assertion was sustained by the result of the division, for Mr. Courtney's amendment was defeated by 246 to 177 votes, and the alteration made in this part of the measure by the House of Lords was confirmed by

the House of Commons. The Lords, therefore, had won the game so far as the further emancipation of women was concerned, and the Bill became law in due course. The Act for the new and better government of London had, like most other reforms in their earlier stages of progress, only marked the way which improvement was destined to take, and had not by any means satisfied the purposes of those who had set the work of improvement in motion. Further measures for the government of London as a great union of municipalities will have to be accomplished before the compromise between the ancient ways and the new can be satisfactorily effected, and we may be sure that what is commonly called the women's movement will not be stayed in its course even though, as was said more than once in the debates on the London Government Bill, it should go in for the right of women to vote for the election of members to sit in the House of Commons.

END OF VOL. I.

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
Edinburgh & London



